

example, the fact, mentioned in your speech, that the German Government does not object to the service, is due to the fact that the traffic rights desired by the United States have been obtained from the German Government in exchange for the grant of traffic rights of equal value for the German airline. Incidentally, the grant to Germany of traffic rights necessary for this purpose was strenuously opposed by certain United States airlines which either had no interest in the extension of TWA's route beyond Frankfurt or which activity opposed such extension for competitive reasons.

It is true that the British Government thus far has refused to grant additional traffic rights in the United Kingdom for TWA operations over the proposed route beyond Frankfurt. Within the last 16 months, this Government has pressed its request during each of 3 formal meetings with representatives of the British Government and has actively pursued the matter through diplomatic channels. It should be emphasized that TWA already is exercising unrestricted rights to carry traffic between New York and London and between London and Frankfurt. These rights would not be affected by the extension of the airline's route beyond Frankfurt. Moreover, the British are interposing no objections to the extension as such. They have not agreed however, to permit TWA to carry traffic between London and points in countries beyond Frankfurt. The British Government takes the position that airlines of Great Britain and the foreign countries involved have primary claim to traffic between their countries; that competitive United States-flag carrier services between such points would have a serious adverse effect on British carriers; and that Great Britain has at present no reciprocal route desires of the United States which would equal in value the additional rights desired by this Government for TWA. The Department remains determined to pursue this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. However, in view of the adamant position of the British Government and the opposition of most United States airlines to the grant of additional traffic rights to British airlines, it is not possible to estimate when this issue may be resolved. In the meantime, of course, the decision to delay the establishment of service beyond Frankfurt in the exercise of the traffic rights already negotiated by this Government rests solely with TWA.

With respect to the portion of your speech which expressed concern lest the Government was abandoning the basic principles

upon which its international air transport policy has been based since 1946, the Department takes this opportunity to assure you without qualification that the Government's actions have been guided by the desire and the determination to give effect to those principles and to encourage adherence to them on the part of foreign governments. All of the bilateral air transport agreements which this Government has concluded since 1946, with the possible exception of that with India, reflect these principles. The bilateral agreement with India differs in some respects from the other air transport agreements which the United States has negotiated since 1946. This was necessitated by the differing philosophy between the two governments as to the methods through which the orderly development of air transportation might best be achieved and by the unique nature of air transport between the two countries.

With regard to the application of United States international air transport policy to specific route exchanges, the agreement with the Netherlands, which was mentioned in your letter, is one of the most controversial. The Department's position in this matter, and the practical problems which it must face in discharging its responsibilities in the interest of the Nation as a whole, were explained by Mr. Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, in a recent address before the International Management Association. A copy of Mr. Kalijarvi's remarks is enclosed.

The Department appreciates your interest in these matters, and hopes that you will find the foregoing comments and the enclosure useful in your continued consideration of the important issues relating to United States international air transport policy.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN S. HOGHLAND II,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 9, 1957.
MR. JOHN S. HOGHLAND II,
Acting Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOGHLAND: Thank you for your letter of July 18, 1957, commenting on the Department's inability to secure operating rights for Trans World Airlines' route beyond London via Frankfurt.

Your position seems to be that international routes result from trades between governments and that the United States has

nothing to offer the British in return for TWA's Frankfurt-Zurich rights. The idea seems to be that we have nothing to trade because we have already given them everything they want.

I understand, moreover, that the United States recently accepted without protest a notice under the United Kingdom bilateral that had the effect of giving the British traffic rights between Tokyo and the United States and that we received nothing in return for this grant. I do not understand why the same procedure cannot be used with respect to TWA's Frankfurt-Zurich rights.

I also understand that there is now in effect an extremely generous interpretation of British rights under the bilateral agreement that extends BOAC's transatlantic route from New York to California. Under that interpretation, BOAC is carrying between California and New York traffic destined for London that is to be carried beyond New York on the lines of another carrier, as well as traffic originating at New York that is destined for points in the Orient on the routes of Qantas. I also understand that BOAC intends to carry across the United States traffic originated in Canada and destined to Honolulu. These appear to be valuable rights arrived at by interpretation in return for which our American carriers again received nothing.

I have been told that BOAC does approximately \$25 million worth of business a year on its transatlantic route to and from the United States, and that just the annual rate of increase in this business for the last 6 years far exceeds the revenues that TWA could expect to receive as a result of extending its operations beyond Frankfurt.

The true interest of our Government must be in the practical effect of the route situation on our carriers and on foreign carriers, and I for one am not impressed by the argument that the British are not asking for anything just now.

Second, your letter explains that TWA could start operating the Frankfurt-Zurich traffic today if it did not carry traffic between London and points east of Frankfurt. Surely you must agree that the right to operate in an uneconomic manner and one not contemplated by the CAB award, cannot be regarded as any right at all.

I would appreciate it if you could from time to time keep me advised of progress made by the Department on this route.

Yours sincerely,
FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, beset by the pressures and problems of a changing social order, we would pause at the beginning of a week freighted with thorny questions of public affairs, to remind our inmost, burdened selves that the Lord is our light and our salvation; the Lord is the strength of our lives; of whom shall we be afraid?

Daily we pray, "Thy kingdom come." Always after that petition we would add, in our hearts, "Thy kingdom come to earth through us." Without a steadfast conviction in that ultimate good, all we have held sacred becomes meaningless. In this day of fear and fatigue and frustration, without this ringing faith we are

lost. In the global struggle now raging for the hearts and minds of men, may our creed be a living flame which will fire our political doctrines and our spiritual ideals with a consuming passion for the faith in which we will gallantly live and readily die. We ask it in the name of the One whose life and death mean life for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 16, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that

on August 16, 1957, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 42. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; and

S. 1446. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for retirement of certain former members of the Coast Guard Reserve.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2391. An act to clarify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the allowance of percentage depletion in the case of sand and gravel extracted from navigable waters;

H. R. 4952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign

tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 8794. An act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions for admissions to certain musical performances;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes;

H. R. 8881. An act to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H. R. 8887. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H. R. 8888. An act to extend the unemployment compensation program;

H. R. 8960. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties for purposes of the personal holding company tax;

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee; and

H. R. 9049. An act to amend section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain loans made by employee trusts.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2391. An act to clarify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the allowance of percentage depletion in the case of sand and gravel extracted from navigable waters;

H. R. 4952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 8794. An act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions for admissions to certain musical performances;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes;

H. R. 8881. An act to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H. R. 8887. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H. R. 8888. An act to extend the unemployment compensation program;

H. R. 8960. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties for purposes of the personal holding company tax;

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee; and

H. R. 9049. An act to amend section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain loans made by employee trusts.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, since the Senate meets today, following an adjournment, there is the usual morning hour. Under the order entered on Friday, statements during the morning hour today will be limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CLAIMS SETTLED UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims settled by that Department under provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and First Assistant Physician of the Hospital, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ALABAMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the State Legislature of Alabama has passed a joint resolution calling upon the Congress of the United States to give relief from certain excise taxes. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 73

Whereas the Congress of the United States levied during World War II certain transportation excise taxes, in the amounts of 10 percent on passenger travel and 3 percent on freight; and

Whereas these taxes were levied as wartime emergency measures, and, as such, have outlived their justification; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a measure which would

effect the repeal of these taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby memorialize and petition, and does respectfully urge, the Congress of the United States to provide a measure of needed tax relief to the people of our Nation by enacting the pending legislation to repeal these "wartime" excise taxes levied on transportation.

Be it further resolved that the secretary of the senate transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Alabama delegation in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COTTON (for Mr. PAYNE), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1728. A bill to provide certain assistance to State and Territorial maritime academies or colleges (Rept. No. 1013).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Viguera Pinar (Rept. No. 1022);

S. 2352. A bill for the relief of Deanna Marie Greene (Okhe Kim) (Rept. No. 1023);

S. 2353. A bill for the relief of Charles Fredrick Canfield (Kim Yo Sep) (Rept. No. 1024);

S. 2488. A bill for the relief of Kim, Hyun Suck (Rept. No. 1025);

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Stefani Daniela and Casablanca Ambra (Rept. No. 1026);

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Westfeldt Bros. (Rept. No. 1017);

H. R. 4336. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Alabama (Rept. No. 1018);

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of Pedro Gonzales (Rept. No. 1027);

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Milton (Rept. No. 1019);

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1020); and

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1021).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Albert A. Heinze (Rept. No. 1033).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mattie Jane Lawson (Rept. No. 1034); and

S. 2110. A bill for the relief of Shirley Leeke Kilpatrick (Rept. No. 1028).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 277. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions (Rept. No. 1014); and

H. R. 4191. An act to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners (Rept. No. 1016).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2205. A bill to amend section 116 (4) of chapter 10 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 1032).

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 3377. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the ac-

quisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (Rept. No. 1029).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2042. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war-housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1035):

H. R. 3877. An act to validate a patent issued to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, for certain land in Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1036); and

H. R. 7864. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1956 (70 Stat. 130), relating to the establishment of public recreational facilities in Alaska (Rept. No. 1037).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 3940. An act to grant certain lands to the Territory of Alaska (Rept. No. 1038).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 6562. An act to clarify the law relating to leasing of lands within Indian reservations in Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1031).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. R. 8508. An act to provide that there shall be two county committees elected under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for certain counties (Rept. No. 1040).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 8030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to acreage history (Rept. No. 1039).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program (Rept. No. 1041).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2460. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain housing projects to the city of Decatur, Ill., or to the Decatur Housing Authority (Rept. No. 1043).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution directing that the financial reports and other information filed with the Secretary of Labor pursuant to subsections (f) and (g) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, be made available to the public (Rept. No. 1042).

INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 188) increasing the limit of expenditures for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and submitted a report (No. 1030) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is authorized to expend

from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, \$15,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS" (S. REPT. NO. 1015)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Government Competition With Private Business," which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2810. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE (by request):

S. 2811. A bill for the relief of Djordje Djelic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2812. A bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the Senator may proceed for 10 minutes.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the amount authorized in Senate Resolution 74, agreed to January 30, 1957, and Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 7, 1957, 85th Congress, authorizing and directing the committee (to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities) is hereby increased by the additional amount of \$150,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this resolution would grant additional funds for the operation of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the

Labor or Management Field for the period from August 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958.

The resolution, I may say, was reported favorably by unanimous vote of the select committee and is submitted by me, as chairman, at the direction of the committee.

A letter of this date giving facts and information together with an estimated budget substantiating the need of the committee for these additional funds is being sent to the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. However, I deem it appropriate that, as chairman, I should at this time make a brief general report to the Senate of the committee's activities to date, and advise the Senate of the work contemplated and planned for the future.

This bipartisan select committee was created by Senate Resolution 74, which passed the Senate on January 30, 1957, and authorized the committee to expend \$350,000. As of July 31, at the end of the first 6 months of its operation, it had expended in round numbers \$194,000, leaving a balance of its original appropriation of \$156,000.

The estimated budget for the period from August 1 to January 31 is \$306,000. Therefore, the additional amount required and requested by this resolution is \$150,000.

We presently have a staff of some 23 professional attorneys and investigators, and 18 clerical personnel. In addition thereto, we have a firm of certified public accountants under contract, and from time to time there are made available to us certain personnel from the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and from departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

It must be borne in mind that a large part of the expense incurred by the committee results from the holding of public hearings. For example, in its first 5 months of operation, witness fees and travel expenses of witnesses amounted to \$22,933; the reporters fees, \$1,245; the travel and per diem expenses of investigators, \$12,290; the contract services of investigative accountants, \$26,711; or a total of \$68,239.

All public hearings have been held in Washington, D. C., and it is contemplated that all future public hearings, with rare exceptions, will be held here in the Capital. We believe this will undoubtedly prove to be more economical in the long run—the bringing of witnesses to Washington—than it would be to transport and pay the expenses of committee members and the staff for the holding of public hearings in other cities.

I should like also to call attention to the role of accountants. Their services cannot be overemphasized. They are a high-cost item, but they are essential, and an integral necessity to enable the

committee to conduct a successful investigation. It is not easy to uncover the rascality of unscrupulous officials who are uncooperative, who conceal and destroy financial records, and who seek to hamper and hinder the investigation in every way possible.

I may say that the magnitude of the task assigned to this committee greatly exceeds, I think, anything that was contemplated at the time the committee was created. The scope of the committee's work is tremendous. We have only started on what needs to be done.

There are more than 17 million working people in the United States who are members of labor unions. There are approximately 71,600 union locals spread all over the United States. The AFL-CIO alone comprises 57,000 locals in 135 national or international unions. In addition, there are 52 independent national and international unions outside the AFL-CIO, such as United Mine Workers, International Longshoremen's Association, and also certain Communist influenced unions such as the Longshoremen Warehouse Union, under the control of Harry Bridges on the west coast, as well as the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union.

The committee has thus far determined that there are at least 11 fields of major investigations that should be covered. They are:

First. Labor and management collusion.

Second. Undemocratic processes.

Third. Misuse of union funds, including welfare and pension funds of any source.

Fourth. Racketeer control.

Fifth. Secondary boycotts.

Sixth. Extortion and robbery.

Seventh. Organizational picketing.

Eighth. Violence.

Ninth. Paper locals.

Tenth. Political activities.

Eleventh. Improper activities by management to prevent organization.

The need to include others as the committee's work progresses may well be anticipated. Since the committee was created, over 50,000 letters or complaints or similar information, have been received. Some of these contain extremely valuable leads. They must be read, analyzed, answered, filed, and, where warranted, processed for further information.

By way of illustration of the detail involved in a preliminary investigation of just one international union, the committee has found it necessary to send letters to some 2,800 locals. This is only the beginning of our inquiry into the affairs of that union.

We have so far conducted public hearings on seven major subjects and areas, as follow:

First. Portland, Oreg., teamsters racketeer case.

Second. Frank Brewster misuse of union funds.

Third. The Dave Beck misuse and peculation of teamster funds.

Fourth. Violence arising out of activities of certain labor leaders in Scranton, Pa.

Fifth. Improper activities and misuse of union funds by the ranking officers of the bakers' union.

Sixth. The misuse and misappropriation of union funds by the president and treasurer of the United Textile Workers.

Seventh. The current hearings into racketeer invasion into the field of labor in the New York City area, and utilization of gangsters and hoodlums to take control of the Joint Council 16 in the New York area.

The committee has heard in public session more than 200 witnesses in over 65 days of hearings. In addition, there have been some executive sessions and a number of committee conferences. For each witness heard by the committee, the staff in pursuing leads has probably interviewed 20 to 25 other persons and has examined hundreds of files, audited hundreds of accounts, bank records, and other books and journals.

We think the hearings thus far have proved most fruitful in revealing conditions which require remedial legislation. We have found that there is a dearth of protection of the working men and women by the diversion and misuse of union dues and welfare funds by unscrupulous union officials and trustees. We have found improper practices in the nature of collusion between some management and some labor officials to the economic advantage of both, and to the detriment of the working people and the economic welfare of the community. We have found improper practices in organizational picketing, in the issuance of union charters, in the conducting of union elections, in the use of violence, extortion, and shakedowns, and in the appointment of racketeers, gangsters, and criminals to official positions in some unions. We have also found indications of improper practices in the use of secondary boycotts.

We have also found a deficiency in the Taft-Hartley Act, particularly in those sections dealing with the filing of financial reports by labor organizations. There are indications that there are flagrant abuses of tax exemptions granted by the Treasury Department to bona fide labor unions. We have encountered the destruction of union books and records—particularly in crucial years and periods when there is strong reason to believe the finances of the unions were being juggled. We have found basic weaknesses in the constitution of certain labor unions—weaknesses which render certain labor union members helpless and at the mercy of unscrupulous leaders.

We have found highly improper relationships—conflict of interest—between the management of certain large industrial firms and labor leaders—situations where management granted favors to labor officials in exchange for expected assistance in the solving of their labor difficulties. We have found convincing evidence of racketeer control of certain unions which could only have been accomplished with the aid and assistance of high-level officials. This racketeer control has resulted in so-called "sweetheart" contracts, which contain little or no benefits to employees. We have found collusion between management

and labor leaders to organize the employees of management on the basis of a sweetheart contract, from which the employees receive little or no benefits, but from which management and the dishonest labor leaders considerably profit.

It is strongly indicated that some of these sweetheart contracts are entered into by collusion between management and labor bosses for the purpose of preventing organization of the employees by a legitimate and honest union.

The foregoing are just some of the things which are receiving the committee's attention and which it proposes to investigate thoroughly and to report its findings to the Senate. The additional funds requested are necessary and required for this committee to carry out its assignment effectively.

The economic savings to the citizens, to the consuming public, and to the Government of the United States resulting from the elimination of racketeering cost in construction work, in foodstuffs, and other everyday necessities will far outweigh any moneys expended by this committee.

Let me give one illustration of the way racketeering in unions costs the Government large sums of money. In the Scranton, Pa., hearings held last April, it was disclosed that a manufacturer had a contract to supply pallets to the United States naval depot in Pennsylvania. Some union officials extorted cash payments of \$175 a week to permit the manufacturer's trucks to be unloaded at a Government depot. The manufacturer wrote the Government about his increased cost of delivery of the pallets by reason of this demand by union officials, and the United States Navy Purchasing Office authorized an increase in the cost price to the manufacturer on his contract in the amount of \$18,581.30 so that the union could be paid. The committee is continuing its inquiry into that situation.

Additional savings can be expected in the Government's recovery of funds in tax cases. Union members and their families will also benefit by the restitution of union funds by various officials who have been brought before the committee and whose defalcations have been exposed.

The committee is not yet prepared to submit legislative recommendations. We expect to continue to work, however, throughout the recess period of Congress. We plan to be and we are hopeful that by the time Congress reconvenes next January, or within a few days thereafter, the committee will be prepared to submit its initial recommendations for remedial legislation.

Let no one underestimate the arduousness of this committee's task, the difficulties it encounters in carrying out its assignment, and the compelling necessity for and the importance of the work it is doing. In many instances, we are not dealing with high-type citizens. Too often it is apparent that we have encountered racketeers, thugs, crooks, bribers, and extortionists. Quite frequently, those who have the information the committee desires—and I am speaking of witnesses of both high and low

estate, men who occupy positions of honor and trust, along with goons and scoundrels—resort to the fifth amendment alike in an effort to shield and to keep from revealing their defalcations and reprehensible conduct. This fifth amendment tactic being used by so many and so capriciously adds greatly to the committee's problems and burdens, but I believe I can assure Senators that each member of the committee is determined, and will not be deterred, but we will pursue our duties without faltering.

And for whatever good we accomplish, a large measure of the credit must go to the loyal, industrious, and competent staff that we have so fortunately been able to assemble. They work with purpose and zeal, and efficiently, long hours each day, and 6 and 7 days each week, in doing the preliminary work which is vital in discovering, screening, organizing, and assembling the evidence, and in making the preparation that is necessary for the presentation of the facts in a successful public hearing.

In conclusion, I should like to report further to the Senate that the committee is working diligently and harmoniously, and I express to each member thereof my deep appreciation and gratitude for the excellent cooperation each has given to me as chairman and for the valuable contribution each has made to the progress and success of the work of the committee thus far. Mr. President, I trust this resolution will be promptly and favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and that it will be unanimously adopted by the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE, SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD, August 19, 1957.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNING, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and
Administration, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to Senate Resolution of the 85th Congress, introduced in the Senate on the day of August 1957, requesting funds for the operation of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field for the period August 1, 1957 through January 31, 1958.

Prior to the submission of this resolution to the Senate, it was reported out favorably by the unanimous vote of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

Attached is the estimated budget for the balance of the year August 1, 1957 through January 31, 1958.

Senate Resolution 74, passed January 30, 1957, authorized the Senate select committee to expend \$350,000.

Expenditures as of July 31, 1957, amounted to \$194,114.33, leaving a balance of \$155,885.77.

The estimated budget for the period August 1, 1957 through January 31, 1958, is \$305,887.77.

The additional amount required and requested under this resolution is \$150,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of \$155,885.77 left over under Senate Resolution 74 as of August 1, 1957.

The increase in expenditures for the second 6 months' period over the first 6 months' period is due to the time lag required to organize a competent staff, and to do considerable preliminary work preparatory to

public hearings. For example, in the first month of its operation, February 1957, only \$6,297.55 was expended; in March, only \$30,217.70; and in April, \$41,256. Each month since then, the staff has been gradually increased to its present point of 41 persons, which is comprised of 23 investigators and counsel, and 18 clerical. The average monthly expense has gradually increased as additional competent personnel has been found and as more public hearings are held on major investigations. It is estimated that the next 6 months' expense will average \$51,000 a month.

It is contemplated that all hearings will be held in Washington, D. C., with rare exceptions. It will undoubtedly prove to be more economical in the long run to bring witnesses to Washington than to transport the committee members and staff to other areas. A large part of the expense incurred by the committee results from the holding of hearings. For example, in its first 5 months of operation, witness fees and travel expenses of witnesses amounted to \$22,993; the reporters' fees, \$1,245; the travel and per diem expenses of investigators in the field in all areas of the country, \$17,290; contract services of investigative accountants, \$26,711; for a total of \$68,239.

The role of the accountants in this investigation cannot be overemphasized. It is a high-cost item, but it is essential and an integral necessity for a successful investigation. It is not easy to uncover the rascality of unscrupulous officials who are uncooperative, who conceal and destroy financial records and seek to hamper the investigation with every means at their disposal.

The committee also has obtained the assistance of staff members of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee on Government Operations and of the General Accounting Office in various areas in the United States, as they are needed.

Every effort has been made to keep the staff in full operative capacity. I know from personal knowledge that many staff members have been working 7 days a week and as late as 10 or 12 o'clock at night.

The scope of the work of this committee is tremendous. The investigations thus far reveal woeful inadequacies in existing laws to cope with the invasion by gangsters and racketeers into the field of labor. There is a dearth of protection to the working man and woman from the speculations and misuse of union dues and welfare funds at the hands of unscrupulous officials and trustees. The need for remedial legislation is obvious, but in order to properly legislate, the facts must be obtained so that a basis for sound legislation can be established.

It is reported that there are 17,385,000 working people in the United States who are members of the unions.

It must be remembered that there are approximately 71,600 union locals spread all over the United States; that the AFL-CIO alone comprises 57,000 locals in 135 national or international unions. In addition, there are 52 independent national or international unions outside of the AFL-CIO, such as the United Mine Workers, the International Longshoremen's Association, and included are certain Communist-influenced unions such as the Longshoremen Warehouse Union under the control of Harry Bridges on the west coast, as well as the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union.

The committee has thus far received sufficient information to determine that there are some 11 fields of major investigation that must be covered. These fields are:

1. Labor and management collusion.
2. Undemocratic processes.
3. Misuse of union funds, including welfare and pension funds of any source.
4. Racketeer control.
5. Secondary boycotts.
6. Extortion and robbery.
7. Organizational picketing.

8. Violence.

9. Paper locals.

10. Political activities.

11. Improper activities by management to prevent organization.

The magnitude of the task is enormous. It is nationwide and the investigations will cover almost every area in the country.

It is estimated that for the first 6 months, over 50,000 letters or complaints of improper labor practices or similar information have been received by the committee. Some of these letters contain extremely valuable leads or information. They must be read, analyzed, answered, filed and, where warranted, processed for further information. Another illustration of the detail involved in an investigation of just one union is the necessity for the circularization of letters to 2,800 locals of the steel-workers union, and this is just the start of an investigation into a single union.

Thus far, the committee has conducted hearings on seven major subjects:

1. Portland, Oreg., teamsters' racketeer case.

2. Frank Brewster misuse of union funds.

3. The Dave Beck misuse and peculation of teamster funds.

4. Violence arising out of activities of certain labor leaders in Scranton, Pa.

5. Improper activities and misuse of union funds by the ranking officers of the bakers union.

6. The misuse and misappropriation of union funds by the president and treasurer of the United Textile Workers.

7. The current hearings into racketeer invasion into the field of labor in the New York City area, and utilization of gangsters and hoodlums to take control of the joint council in the New York area.

Thus far, the committee has heard almost 200 witnesses and has held over 55 days of hearings, with approximately an additional 50 or 60 witnesses to be heard in the current hearings on racketeering in the New York area. In addition, the committee has held a number of executive hearings. It must be borne in mind that for each witness heard by the committee, the staff has probably interviewed and investigated perhaps 25 persons, and to conduct the hearings, the staff has audited hundreds of accounts, bank records, and other books of account.

The hearings thus far have proved most fruitful in revealing conditions which require remedial legislation. The additional funds are essential and necessary to carry out the function of the committee.

The economic savings to the citizens and consuming public of the United States resulting from the elimination of racketeering costs in construction work, in foodstuffs, and other everyday necessities, will far outweigh the money expended by this committee.

Additional savings can be expected in the Government's recovery of funds in tax cases of Dave Beck, Frank Brewster, and others. Union members will also benefit by the restitution of union funds by various officials who have been brought before the committee and whose defalcations have been exposed.

If there is any further information you desire concerning the proposed operation of this Senate select committee during the coming year, I will be glad to confer with you or members of your committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on my time, because I know the time of the Senator has been exhausted, I may say to him that I have listened attentively to his remarks. I think he and his committee are to be commended for the work they have done to date in the very important field to which the Senator has referred.

I am not prepared, of course, to pass upon the details of the additional authorization the Senator is requesting, but that question will be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which the resolution will be referred. I know the Senator would not ask for funds unless he felt the request was justified, and that he will be prepared to justify the request for funds before the committee.

If the Senator and his committee have done nothing else, they have underscored once again the fact that with power must go responsibility. That is true whether it refers to a labor organization, a business organization, or the Government itself.

I am sure the Senator is going to demonstrate to the membership of labor unions and to the American public that they are entitled to have honestly spent and fully accounted for the funds which are gathered, many times involuntarily, from the members of the great labor organizations. I am sure the Senator will insist upon the maintenance of the highest standards of law and order in this field, as well as in any other field. The Senator is to be commended for this work.

I am sure he will find on both sides of the aisle bipartisan support for the necessary job which has to be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader. I may say that I am sure every Senator would like to have a nice, long vacation after this arduous session of Congress. However, our committee has a large staff which has been quite busy, and it is the plan of the committee to hold several series of public hearings during the period of adjournment of the Congress, so that we will not be wasting money, and will be getting the full benefit of the cost of operation of the committee. We are going to work. Our hope is to return the first of January with some concrete recommendations for legislation. Of course, any proposals for legislation will go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the committee will probably hold further hearings in regard to them. I believe that from our hearings and from the revelations which have been made—and which the committee will continue to make—we will find the basis for sound legislation, which will certainly have a strong tendency to curb a recurrence in the future of the practices which have led to the investigations.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on my own time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to do so.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to express a personal word of appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas for his splendid report this morning. Of course, I am only one of many in this body, but every Member of the Senate has followed the work of the Senator and his committee with great interest and tremendous admiration.

I recall very well the words of the majority leader some time ago—perhaps it was even last year—when he said, speaking of the senior Senator from

Arkansas, "He is one upon whom we have been accustomed to place very heavy burdens of responsibility."

I think most of us feel that the distinguished Senator is carrying more than his share of the heavy burdens of a United States Senator, but he is doing so with magnificent spirit, determination, courage, wisdom, and patience, which has won the admiration of people all over the United States. I certainly wish to express my appreciation to him, and also say that we shall await with the very keenest interest, and with sympathetic interest, his recommendations, and the recommendations of the committee, for legislation to help us deal with the frightening situation about which the Senator's committee has developed information.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to add my words of praise to the thought expressed by the minority leader and the Senator from Connecticut. As the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have watched with keen interest the operation of this important committee of which the Senator from Arkansas is chairman. I can say that we are all inspired by the work the Senator is doing, and the fact that he is getting at the heart of some of the most serious problems in the entire labor situation. In common with other Senators, I thank the Senator for what he has done. We look forward with interest to the continued work of his committee. I know the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] joins with me in saying we look forward to receiving recommendations for proposed legislation to deal with some of the terrible problems which have been uncovered, when the Senator and his committee report next year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 187), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, \$10,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 154, agreed to August 6, 1957.

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported the following original resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 188. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement regarding the bill, and a table showing how the bill would apply in the case of the several States, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2810) providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public-community colleges, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Public Community College Construction Act of 1957."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes that the Nation faces a severe shortage of college facilities for training of qualified young men and women. It also acknowledges the steady growth in need for semiprofessional and technical workers who require more preparation than high school, but less than 4 years of college.

It is therefore the purpose of this act to assist in—

- (1) supplying the greatly increasing need for college training facilities, and
- (2) solving the problem of increasing costs for such training,

by providing a 5-year emergency program of financial assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

(1) the term "public community college" means an educational institution under public supervision and control and limited to first and second year college grade courses;

(2) the term "State" means a State, Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or the District of Columbia;

(3) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(4) the terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities;

(5) the term "public community college facilities" means classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public;

(6) the term "high school graduate" means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or simi-

lar means) from an approved school for successful completion of 4 years of education beyond the first 8 years of school work, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this act, the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of "high school graduate" shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner of Education.

(7) the term "per capita income" means the average of the per capita income for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce;

(8) the term "national base" means, with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 4, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates; and

(9) the term "State agency" means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 7 (1).

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

Sec. 4. For the purpose of this act there is authorized to be appropriated \$50 million for each of the 5 successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1958.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES AND FEDERAL SHARE

Sec. 5 (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 4 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 4 for such year as the product of—

(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amounts certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of the junior college facilities constructed by it under the State plan approved pursuant to section 7.

(c) For purposes of this act—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for the Continental United States, except that (A) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and except further that the allotment ratio for Hawaii shall be .50, and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and on the basis of the number of high school graduates as determined by the Commissioner for the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Office of Education.

(3) The term "Continental United States" does not include Alaska.

MATCHING REQUIREMENT

Sec. 6. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon

the matching of Federal funds by State funds, as follows: Each State shall add to the Federal allotment an amount equal to the product of (A) the number of high school graduates in the State and (B) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided*, That in no case is the State matching payment required to be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

STATE PLANS

Sec. 7. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this act shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this act. Such plan shall—

(1) designate the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this act;

(3) provide fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this act and to assure proper application of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

(4) provide for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this act, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

(5) provide for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a), but shall not fully disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording to the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 8 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 8 (a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 8 (a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 8. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 6; and

(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this act,

the Commissioner shall reserve an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this act.

(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the States which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 9. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action under section 7 (c), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 10. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this act except the making of regulations.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for Federal administrative expenses such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL

Sec. 11. Except as specifically provided by this act, no department, agency, officer, or

employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirement with respect to, any State agency or educational agency or institution to which any funds have been or may be paid under this act.

The statement presented by Mr. CASE of New Jersey is as follows:

Senator CASE of New Jersey announced that he will introduce in the Senate today (Monday) a second bill to help meet the growing shortage in college facilities.

Last week the Senator sponsored legislation providing aid for States in planning expansion of college capacity.

The Senator's new bill would help the States establish and expand public community colleges. The 2-year institutions, which have had a phenomenal growth, were recommended highly by President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School last week.

In renewing his support for the near-home nonboarding colleges, Senator CASE said:

"Parents of college-age youngsters today are faced with four problems:

"1. A tremendous demand for admission to college has developed as a result of the sharp rise in the birth rate.

"2. A steadily increasing proportion of young people is going to college.

"3. The cost of a college education is steadily rising, now averaging \$2,000 a year.

"4. The need for training beyond the high school, but less than 4 years of college, has grown. In many fields of work there are now five jobs requiring 2 years of college for each one requiring a 4-year college education.

"The youngster from a home of modest means runs a real risk in these circumstances

of losing out on a college education. This may mean inadequate preparation for living as well as for earning a living.

"The 2-year community college, it seems to me, could go far to overcome these objections. The President's Committee report included these comments:

"Communities or groups of neighboring communities faced with an impending shortage of higher educational capacity will do well to consider new 2-year community colleges as part of the solution. Experience in a number of areas has demonstrated that with carefully planned facilities and programs community colleges can be highly effective in affording readily available opportunities for excellent education beyond the high school.

"The program of the comprehensive community college includes: (a) The first 2 years of a full collegiate program; (b) many kinds of programs, varying in time-requirements, needed by vast numbers of students for general education integrated with vocational-technical training for the subprofessional occupations; (c) many kinds of short courses required for upgrading employed persons and for retraining employees because of technological developments or displacements; and (d) adult or continuing education programs and courses desired by the community.

"These institutions extend further educational opportunities to youth and adults near their homes, thereby reducing the cost to students and frequently to the taxpayers. The cost of constructing a community college where boarding facilities are not required is less than the cost of constructing a residential college. In many cases, at least part of the facilities are available in the local high school on a temporary basis. The

program offerings may cover a wide diversity of courses of study and training especially geared to the needs of local occupations in agriculture, business, and industry.

"In addition, the community college provides a favorable opportunity for students who have not decided on a career to explore more fully their interests and plans.

"Studies in California, where the community college has developed most widely, have shown that students transferring to the junior year of senior institutions have done at least as well as students who had originally entered the senior institution as freshmen. This kind of arrangement has given the senior colleges and universities the opportunity to increase their concentration on upper division and graduate work for which they are particularly well equipped."

"My bill," Senator CASE said, "would provide a 5-year emergency program of Federal assistance to the States to help 2-year colleges get started or help existing ones to grow. The aid would be made available on a formula reflecting the number of high-school graduates in a State in a particular year and the per capita income of the State. The funds would be granted for physical plant and equipment on a matching basis with the State government putting up from half to two-thirds and the Federal Government the remainder.

"The legislation would authorize expenditure by the Federal Government of up to 50 million a year to stimulate construction of needed college capacity by the States. This sum, plus the amount expended by the State, would be expected to provide for about 250,000 students who might otherwise go without college training."

The table presented by Mr. CASE of New Jersey is as follows:

Allotment of \$50,000,000 to States under proposed bill by Senator Case (New Jersey) for junior colleges (allotment ratios restricted to limits of 0.25 and 0.75)

[National base = (authorized appropriation ÷ high-school graduate) × 3 = \$38.69 × 3 = \$116.07 per high-school graduate]

Region and State	High-school graduates ¹	Personal income per capita ²	Allotment ratio	Allotment		State matching requirement		Region and State	High-school graduates ¹	Personal income per capita ²	Allotment ratio	Allotment		State matching requirement	
				Total amount (thousands)	Amount for high-school graduate	Total amount (thousands)	Amount per high-school graduate					Total amount (thousands)	Amount for high-school graduate	Total amount (thousands)	Amount per high-school graduate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Aggregate United States	1,292,447			\$50,000	\$38.69	\$86,698	\$67.08	SOUTH—cont.							
Continental United States		\$1,801	0.5000					Georgia	23,977	\$1,265	.6488	\$1,192	\$49.71	\$1,591	\$66.36
NORTHEAST								Kentucky	20,311	1,221	.6610	1,029	50.66	1,329	65.41
Connecticut	14,992	2,428	.3259	374	24.95	748	49.90	Louisiana	20,693	1,308	.6369	1,010	48.81	1,392	67.26
Maine	7,117	1,498	.5941	318	44.68	508	71.39	Maryland	16,149	1,975	.4517	559	34.62	1,118	69.24
Massachusetts	40,171	2,006	.4431	1,364	33.95	2,728	67.90	Mississippi	15,129	890	.7500	869	57.44	887	58.63
New Hampshire	4,452	1,643	.5439	186	41.78	331	74.29	North Carolina	37,103	1,191	.6694	1,903	51.29	2,404	64.78
New Jersey	37,315	2,254	.3742	1,070	28.67	2,140	57.34	Oklahoma	22,858	1,470	.5919	1,037	45.37	1,616	70.70
New York	110,147	2,191	.3917	3,305	30.01	6,610	60.02	South Carolina	15,492	1,098	.6952	825	53.25	973	62.82
Pennsylvania	94,724	1,868	.4814	3,493	36.88	6,986	73.76	Tennessee	24,232	1,225	.6599	1,225	50.55	1,588	65.52
Rhode Island	5,091	1,912	.4692	183	35.95	366	71.90	Texas	60,450	1,579	.5616	2,601	43.03	4,415	73.04
Vermont	3,116	1,470	.5919	141	45.25	221	70.82	Virginia	22,333	1,500	.5836	999	44.73	1,593	71.34
NORTH CENTRAL								West Virginia	18,619	1,260	.6502	928	49.84	1,233	66.23
Illinois	72,279	2,201	.3890	2,154	29.80	4,308	59.60	District of Columbia	4,216	2,253	.3745	121	28.70	242	57.40
Indiana	37,555	1,870	.4808	1,383	36.83	2,766	73.66	WEST							
Iowa	28,273	1,597	.5566	1,206	42.66	2,076	73.41	Arizona	6,494	1,595	.5572	277	42.65	477	73.42
Kansas	19,727	1,658	.5397	816	41.36	1,474	74.71	California	92,389	2,212	.3859	2,731	29.56	5,462	59.12
Michigan	57,334	2,086	.4209	1,849	32.25	3,698	64.50	Colorado	12,468	1,729	.5200	497	39.86	950	76.21
Minnesota	31,755	1,663	.5383	1,310	41.25	2,376	74.82	Idaho	6,817	1,463	.5938	310	45.47	481	70.60
Missouri	31,239	1,745	.5155	1,234	39.50	2,392	76.57	Montana	6,058	1,788	.5036	234	38.63	468	77.26
Nebraska	14,079	1,588	.5591	603	42.83	1,031	73.24	Nevada	1,512	2,393	.3356	39	25.79	78	51.58
North Dakota	6,586	1,265	.6488	327	49.65	437	66.42	New Mexico	5,611	1,408	.6091	262	46.69	389	69.38
Ohio	69,197	2,014	.4409	2,337	33.77	4,674	67.54	Oregon	14,405	1,802	.4997	552	38.29	1,103	76.58
South Dakota	6,960	1,305	.6377	340	48.85	468	67.22	Utah	8,773	1,528	.5758	387	44.11	631	71.96
Wisconsin	36,100	1,752	.5136	1,421	39.36	2,769	76.71	Washington	21,681	1,974	.4520	751	34.64	1,502	69.28
SOUTH								Wyoming	3,082	1,804	.4992	118	38.29	236	76.58
Alabama	26,760	1,105	.6932	1,421	53.10	1,685	62.97	OUTLYING PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES							
Arkansas	15,630	1,012	.7190	861	55.09	953	60.98	Alaska	577		.7500	33	57.44	84	58.63
Delaware	2,498	2,470	.3143	60	24.02	120	48.04	Guam	254		.7500	15	57.44	15	58.63
Florida	22,151	1,595	.5572	946	42.71	1,625	73.36	Puerto Rico	10,291		.7500	591	57.44	603	58.63
								Territory of Hawaii	5,075		.5000	194	38.31	389	76.62
								Virgin Islands	150		.7500	9	57.44	9	58.63

¹ School year 1953-54, based principally on reports from State departments of education.

² Average for calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955. Source: Survey of Current Business, August 1956.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles and reports pertaining to the subject matter dealt with by the bill I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT PERTAINING TO PROJECTED DEFICIT OF INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS BY 1962, PREPARED BY MR. W. ROBERT BOKELMAN, SPECIALIST FOR COLLEGE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

By 1962, 5 years from now, conservative projections indicate that we must be prepared to accommodate 1,057,000 students in addition to the 1956 fall enrollment of 2,947,000.

Preliminary returns from 1,450 colleges and universities participating in a study of physical facilities made by the Office of Education show that we are constructing facilities, exclusive of residential housing, at a rate that will accommodate 635,000 additional students within the next 5 years. This rate of construction will provide instructional space for 127,000 more students each year. A deficit of 422,000 students unprepared for by 1962 (1,057,000 minus 635,000) will then exist.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of June 14, 1957]

CRISIS IN THE COLLEGES

A crisis of major proportions is fast approaching for the colleges of this country. The crisis is one of too little money, too few teachers, and a shortage of classrooms to handle the flood of young men and women who soon will be beating at the doors of all institutions of higher learning.

College officials recognize that this crisis already exists today for many—and that it will come for many, many others in the years just ahead.

At hand is the time when a college education is going to have to be denied to many thousands of qualified and ambitious students unless drastic steps are taken to meet this crisis.

To find what college authorities are now planning to do to meet this problem, and what they see as its solution, U. S. News & World Report queried presidents of colleges and universities in all parts of the country. Replies were received from 138 institutions. From those replies is drawn this broad picture:

A period of vast expansion lies ahead for American colleges. This expansion, if carried out, is going to cost a lot of money—perhaps a billion dollars a year. This would mean higher taxes.

Biggest expansion will be in the State universities, which are going to have to handle the bulk of the huge enrollment growth ahead. Big State universities are preparing to double in size. University of California, with 40,000 students now, foresees 96,000 by 1970. University of Michigan, now educating 22,000, expects a minimum of 40,000 within 10 years.

Junior colleges, already growing up in the West and Middle West, are likely to spread throughout the country in great numbers. These 2-year institutions are suggested by many college heads as an answer to the problem of the future.

Despite all this expansion, the prospect is that colleges still are not going to have enough room for all the youngsters who will want to enter.

Higher standards, as a result, are going to be set as a means of holding enrollments down to capacity. Entrance requirements, already going up, will be raised even higher.

Colleges will be far more selective in choosing students. Many students of the type who have been admitted in the past will be denied entrance in the future. This is especially true of the private schools, concentrated in the East, which do not plan much expansion.

What created this crisis in the colleges is the great change that has taken place in the educational pattern of this country. It used to be that only a comparatively few youngsters went to college—only 1 out of 25 in 1900 and only 1 out of 12 as late as 1930.

Today, more than one third of all Americans of college age are going to college, and the percentage is going up every year. In 10 years the prospect is that nearly half of all youngsters will seek a college education.

Result is, college enrollment has grown from about 250,000 in 1900 to a total of 3.2 million today—and this enrollment is expected to double by 1967. It may triple by 1975.

This means that colleges are going to have to become highly selective in the students they admit—or ways are going to have to be found to handle millions of new students.

Some methods that would help colleges take care of more students are suggested by the college leaders questioned by U. S. News & World Report.

Sweeping changes are proposed. One idea is to keep colleges open the year around instead of only 9 months, with the present system of 2 semesters per year being replaced by 1 of 4 quarters or 3 semesters, and with students spending part of each year in study off the campus.

Night and Saturday classes are proposed as another way to make better use of the available classrooms.

Instruction by television is suggested as a means of enabling teachers to handle larger classes. This already has been tried in some schools.

Such suggestions as this point up one of the most difficult problems facing the colleges: the shortage of teachers.

Money alone, college presidents point out, cannot solve this problem. With money, you can build classrooms in a hurry—but it takes years to educate and train a teacher.

Where will the money come from which colleges need for expansion? It is clear from the survey: Most of it is going to have to come from taxes. Outlook now is that private donations will fall far short of the need.

Where is the squeeze going to be tightest for the youngster who hopes to go to college? The survey indicates: in the East. It is in the West and Middle West where plans for college expansion appear greatest.

[From Time magazine of February 4, 1957]
HERE COME THE WAR BABIES—UNITED STATES COLLEGES ARE ILL PREPARED FOR THEIR INVASION

As he gives informal talks to alumni across the United States, the dean of admissions of a famous ivy league university likes to give the old grads a jolt. "If you were to apply for your alma mater today," he is quoted as saying, "only 20 percent of you would get it." In that particular play the dean is not alone. Says Acting President Archibald MacIntosh of Haverford College: "I have occasionally talked to alumni about getting into Haverford today and have told them, 'I sometimes doubt if I would have admitted myself.'"

Though both men are intentionally exaggerating, their words illustrate a point. Never before have so many Americans wanted to get into college—and never before has the competition been so keen. Last week the United States Office of Education estimated that before the school year is out enrollment in United States colleges and universities will hit a record high of 3,250,000. This record comes at a time when the col-

lege-age population, which in 1955 sank to its lowest point in 25 years, is still made up mostly of depression babies. The crisis that the United States campus is now bracing for is the coming invasion of war babies.

THE PATTERN

So far only the big-name colleges, mostly in the East, have really felt the first impact of the great tidal wave. Though the number of high-school students who go on to college has jumped from 15 percent in 1940 to 40 percent, the Nation's 1,800 institutions of higher learning can still keep up with the demand. But what of the years immediately ahead? By the time the present crop of first-graders is ready for college, says Dean of Admissions Arthur Howe, Jr., of Yale, enrollments may soar to between 5 million and 8 million. What the favored campuses are going through now will soon become the standard pattern for all.

Last fall Oberlin College was able to accept only 1 out of 2 of those who applied. Since the 1940's Yale's applicants have jumped from 1,500 to 4,000; Harvard's have more than trebled. For the 6,000 boys who say they want to get into Dartmouth next fall there are only 725 openings. Says Dean Emory Walker, Jr., of Brown (present freshman class, 635): "Ten years from now we might have 10,000 applicants. That will be the real problem."

PANIC AND DEALS

Actually, the problem is all too real right now for thousands of high-school students. In their panic to get into college—and in their wild search for the best scholarship deals—today's youngsters have acquired the habit of applying to as many schools as possible. One Connecticut boy, for instance, was able to choose between Amherst, which offered him no scholarship, Bates, which offered \$600, Wesleyan with a \$500 offer, Holy Cross with \$700, and Yale with \$1,250. Another boy sent Princeton an irate letter after he was rejected, pointed out that of the 23 colleges he applied for, 22 had accepted him. What, the boy wanted to know, was wrong with Princeton?

Because of these multiple applications, the favored schools are haunted by "ghosts." These are the students who are accepted but go elsewhere—the boys and girls say the admission officers, "who won't take 'Yes' for an answer." To make sure of an entering class of 1,200, the University of Pennsylvania accepts 2,100 students. Princeton accepts 1,200 to get a class of 750. Stanford estimates that 35 percent of those accepted will probably never show.

BRIGHTER AND BRIGHTER

By piling up the total number of applications, the ghosts tend to distort the demand for higher education. But the demand is nevertheless there—and it has already begun to change the whole sociology of United States higher education. With more and more students to choose from, the big-name campuses are becoming more and more selective. At Harvard the number of students on the dean's list has gone up from 27 percent before World War II to nearly 40 percent. Indeed, says Amherst Dean of Freshmen Eugene Wilson, "in 5 or 10 years we may have 80 to 90 percent of our students capable of honors work."

Not only is the gentleman's C beginning to disappear, but to some extent so is the gentleman. "A college education," says Headmaster Edward Hall of the Hill School, "is no longer a hereditary right like a membership in a club. It is a prize to be won against increasingly rigorous competition." Though the child of the old grad may still have a slight advantage, even top private eastern prep schools can no longer guarantee him a place in the college of his choice. Says Headmaster Hall: "It's kind of hard on the Yale alumnus who develops a kid as bright as his father but no brighter."

The emphasis on college board aptitude tests has hastened the change. Since no one can prepare for them, the extra cramming that a prep school offers can no longer get the dullard through. Furthermore, the top private colleges have become increasingly less parochial in their search for students. Though swamped by applications, they still send out recruiters to schools all over the United States. They want not only a bright student body, but a broad one; and wealth and background are less and less a factor. In 1910 only 10 percent of the men who applied for Harvard asked for scholarship aid; now 50 percent do. In 1947 the ratio of private- to public-school graduates at Yale was 3 to 2; today it is the reverse.

OPEN DOOR?

The approach of the tidal wave has also had an effect on publicly supported institutions. Those that are required by law or tradition to take in every taxpayer's child with a high-school diploma within their States have begun to wonder whether they can expand rapidly enough to maintain their open-door policy. Some have already answered "No."

Since California has the most elaborate junior-college system in the country, the university is able to require that applicants have a B average in high school. But in such States as Oregon, where junior colleges are rare, many educators have begun to worry about what the tidal wave of students will do to their schools unless admissions standards go up. "It seems to me," says Chancellor John Richards of the State higher education system, "that if the weight of numbers of students threatens college instructional quality, then it is our clear obligation to control the numbers." Adds President Jean Paul Mather of the University of Massachusetts, which is studying a plan to consider only the top 20 percent of State high-school students: "In the future, we are going to have to place a tremendous faith in tests. We are the first to admit that there are faults in this, but for us it is not a matter of expediency. It is a matter of necessity. We have to get the horde off our necks."

RETENTION VERSUS ADMISSION

As the standards go up at both private and public institutions, some educators have begun to worry about whether the emphasis on brains and tests might go too far. Many State-supported schools still feel they have a moral obligation to give every taxpayer's child his chance, even though he may flunk out. "We believe," says President Fred Hovde of Purdue University, "in the doctrine of opportunity. If students fail, they at least know they've had their chance." To Headmaster Seymour St. John of Choate, mere quickness of mind may become far too important. "Is there not a hazard," he asks, "of neglecting by default other vital factors in a student's makeup?" Adds Admissions Director Robert Jackson of Oberlin: "You have to leave the door open for the Winston Churchills. It is said of him that on the basis of his school record, he wouldn't be admitted to any college today."

Unfortunately, there is no sure scientific way to identify late-blooming Churchills. But most campuses try their best to look for more than brains. Today, says director of admissions Charles William Edwards, of Princeton, "we talk in terms of the ideal entering class, not the ideal individual candidate. We want a well-rounded class. We wouldn't want everybody to be geniuses in physics, or editors of their school newspapers." "We want," says Dean Walker, of Brown, "the brightest boys, but we want them balanced, too." A typical well-balanced group is this year's freshman class at Yale. Of 1,031 boys, 506 were captains of varsity teams or won varsity letters, 228 were editors of their school papers, 114 were editors of

their yearbook, 178 were either presidents of their student councils or of their senior classes.

BRIBES AND PHONE CALLS

With all this emphasis on brains and balance, the competition to get into college sometimes becomes a desperate affair. Dean Robert Pitt, of the University of Pennsylvania, says that in 1 year he received phone calls or letters from 10 governors, as many Congressmen, and a host of board chairmen, all interested in pushing candidates. He has also been offered bribes. ("O. K., how much do you want?" demanded one father as he whipped out his checkbook), has seen another father offer the university \$3,000 if only it would take his son in. In Washington, D. C., the wife of a State Department official is even planning to move to France so that her two sons can learn French and German and thus have an advantage when the time for college comes. One Princeton alumnus hounded his alma mater to take in his boy, even though he knew the boy would probably flunk. The father's argument: unless his son got in, he would not be eligible for the Princeton Club of New York.

To cut down on the number of student casualties and parental disappointments, city after city has organized elaborate counseling programs to try to identify the college material early and to steer students to the schools best suited to them. At the same time, private prep schools are trying to persuade ambitious fathers not to think only in terms of big-name colleges. But says Headmaster W. Gray Mattern, Jr., of Wilbraham (Mass.) Academy, "It's difficult to convince the third generation Harvard man that his obviously unqualified son just won't be admitted. After a while, you get tired of talking and say, 'All right, go ahead and apply,' even though you know it's hopeless."

GOODBY, LOAFER

No matter how much United States higher education expands or how many junior colleges the Nation builds, there will still be casualties, because the admissions standards of most colleges are bound to keep rising. But to Headmaster Lloyd M. Clark, of Pennsylvania's Kiskiminetas Springs School, the big competition for education is not a crisis but a cause for rejoicing. "This change at the admissions office," says he, "has altered the atmosphere all over the campus. In the classrooms the professors can insist on high achievement levels and dismiss the loafer. * * * The time has come when the college student must really produce. * * * How the educators love this."

In Marin County, Calif., last week, young Mike Zeller, a senior at the Sir Francis Drake High School, added an observation of his own that is as good a summary as any of the plight of the American student: "We all have the feeling," says he, "that we're not going to get into the college we want to. When I was a sophomore, older kids told me that it was tough to get into college. But I didn't believe it. When you're a sophomore, you want to have fun. I wish somebody had made me believe it. I'm really sweating it now."

[From Better Homes and Gardens of June 1957]

HOW TO BREAK THROUGH THE COLLEGE JAM-UP (By Mort Welsinger)

Within the next 5 years, thousands of parents ambitious for the future of their children will meet with crushing disappointment. The bumper crop of babies they raised during the postwar years will face a no-room shingle on every college in the land. For countless teen-agers, graduation day in June will no longer mean commencement, but a day symbolizing a dead end for their scholastic careers.

Here are some of the storm signals which are giving deans and dads nightmares:

This year, Cornell University, swamped with more than 10,000 applications, was able to accept less than 25 percent of them. Last semester, Oberlin College was able to admit only one out of every two students who applied. Since the 1940's Yale's applicants have soared from 1,500 to 4,000, Harvard's have more than trebled. For the estimated 6,000 boys who will apply at Dartmouth this fall, there will be only 725 vacancies. Marietta College in Ohio reports that 66 percent more students have applied this year than last.

The outlook for the future is even grimmer. The New Jersey State Board of Education, for example, reports that, by 1963, one out of every three young people in New Jersey wanting to go to college will find no place. Says Dean Emory Walker, Jr., of Brown: "Our present freshman class is 635. Ten years from now we might have 10,000 applicants. That will be the real problem." And at Rutgers University officials predict they will have to reject several thousand qualified students during the next 8 years because of limited facilities.

It would be folly to discount these figures as scare statistics which apply only to our big-name colleges. A study completed recently by President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School predicts that by 1970, at least 6 million youngsters will be college bound—roughly double the present total. By that time, according to present indications, the Association of American Colleges expects our Nation's 1,800 institutions of higher learning will have space only for little more than 4 million.

This means that more than 1½ million qualified boys and girls now in high school will have their dreams of a college education shattered. They will miss education necessary to equip them for a profession. For each youth, the loss will be catastrophic. Authorities estimate that a college education increases an individual's earning power by at least \$100,000 during his productive life. To the country, the loss will be incalculable. The Nation will lose the benefits of our younger generation's talents, often referred to as "discoveries unmade and services unrendered." Military experts shudder at the thought of how this waste of brain power will increase Russia's technological advantages over ours.

Another solid barrier on the road to higher education is the high finance problem. It now costs the average college about \$600 more to educate a student than the college charges him for tuition. With 2½ million students in college today, the tuition deficit runs to at least a billion and a half a year. By 1975, even if faculty salaries remain exactly where they are, our institutions will really be in trouble; they will have to cope with an annual \$5 billion tuition deficit. In the face of this fiscal Frankenstein, how can colleges hope to expand?

But it is not only these costs that are worrying educators. They are also concerned about the financial burden that parents who want to send their children to college must carry. A father desirous of putting his 2 or 3 children through college will have to ante up a whopping \$25,000 for the privilege, a terrific drain on any family budget. If inflation continues, millions will find the price of a diploma a prohibitive luxury.

How can we cope with the coming college crisis before it reaches epidemic proportions? To investigate the problem, Better Homes and Gardens assigned this reporter to explore the views of educators, college presidents, legislators, industrialists, and others who have made a serious study of this dilemma. Their realistic recommendations offer a blueprint for the educational survival of our children.

Perhaps the most practical solution to the challenge of crowded campuses is the 2-year public community college. Sponsored by New Jersey's Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, this plan has the enthusiastic endorsement of President Eisenhower and James B. Conant, formerly president of Harvard.

Educators look favorably upon the community college because it can serve as a screening device for the 4-year college, a badly needed service since fully half the freshman-sophomore classes in 4-year institutions drop out at the end of the second year. Inasmuch as it is in the first 2 years of college that the greatest shortage exists, the community colleges will complement, rather than compete with the 4-year college. By absorbing much of the freshman-sophomore load, the community colleges make it possible for the 4-year colleges to do a more effective job on the remaining 2 years and in the professional schools.

Clearly, the community college plan produces the most for the tax dollar. It avoids the expensive costs of building dormitories and of long-distance transportation. It gives the student a chance to remain at home, to find part-time work among his friends and neighbors, and perhaps to combine education and work. From the viewpoint of business and industry, it permits planning of curriculum to meet local needs for technical and skilled manpower. It permits cooperative arrangements for industrial help where faculty specialists and equipment are not available. In many areas, it will be possible for community colleges to use certain high-school buildings, laboratories, and training equipment.

The community college plan is well past the pie-in-the-sky stage. Presently, 26 States have laws permitting the establishment of community or junior colleges and 16 States have a program of State aid for them. Says Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California: "I would today urge high-school students to attend junior colleges unless there is a compelling reason for them to go to a 4-year college away from home. Junior college graduates who could have met the admission requirements of our university, when they were graduated from high school, do as well when they transfer to the university for their junior and senior years as do our so-called native students."

It is Senator CASE's hope that his proposed program, should it catch on, will serve as a stimulus to encourage every State in the country to sponsor community colleges. "Obviously, this program would require a large sum," Senator CASE said when interviewed, "but our Government is already spending millions and millions to assist our farmers, our airlines, and our shipping firms. Surely, our youth and their future are equally important."

[From Good Housekeeping of February 1957]

WHY NOT CONSIDER A JUNIOR COLLEGE?

(By Michael Drury)

If your high-school days are almost over and what comes next seems like one big question mark, there may be an answer you haven't considered: the 2-year junior college. There are more than 500 such junior colleges accredited in the United States today, and this fall they are the final choice of approximately one-fifth of all young people entering all institutions of higher learning.

Many people are aware that junior colleges exist, but they think of them either as "just trade schools" or as places where young ladies are taught the niceties of proper living. Actually, they are no such thing. Nor are they second-rate substitutes for college. First started some 50 years ago, the junior college has become an educational form in

itself, in some ways different from colleges and particularly adapted to our modern high-speed, highly specialized society. It is our fastest growing educational method, it is peculiarly American, and it's made to order for young people going places in a hurry.

How is it different from college? For one thing, junior colleges grant degrees in 2 years (typical ones are A. A. and A. C., for associate in art and associate in commerce) instead of 4. Their entrance requirements generally are less arbitrary than those of the colleges, and almost anyone who graduates from an accredited high school can qualify for junior college, though not necessarily every junior college. More basically, however, the difference might be summed up this way: A college or university seeks to fit students to the needs of certain professions such as law, medicine, engineering, business administration, and so on. A junior college goes at it the other way around. It seeks to fit its courses to the students' needs. You may be fascinated by law, for instance, but not care for the idea of becoming a lawyer. Is there a place for you in the legal world? And can you train for that place? There is, and you can—at a junior college. You will see how in a minute.

This doesn't mean you can float dreamily through 2 years taking any subjects you wish and emerge educated. All accredited junior colleges require attention to such basic items of learning as English, math, science, or history—sometimes all four. But it does mean you can begin at once to study some field that excites and interests you—aviation or child care, food or nursing, art, agriculture, electronics, drafting, theater. You name it and you can have it, for that is another feature of the junior colleges—they have tremendous variety and scope. There is almost certainly one to fit your aims, your talents, your budget.

Suppose you have a brother who is captivated by electronics. He's been building radio sets and fooling around with television since he was 10. He likes working with his hands, but he likes figuring things out, too. An engineering degree is 4 or 5 years away, and anyway, he's not sure he'd like it. That's good; the country needs him. It has been estimated that for every engineering job, there are four to five openings for skilled technicians—men who supervise workers, assistants to engineers, specialists in the TV industry, people with a working knowledge of theory and practice in many areas. A junior college can help equip him for such a job.

Or let's get back to that person who likes law, a girl, perhaps, who doesn't really fancy herself as a lady lawyer. She can become a legal secretary or a court reporter, working in a field she loves and being well paid and much in demand. The right junior college will help her get there. The market for secretaries with a knowledge of medicine, law, electronics, aviation, oil, and dozens of other specialized fields is already great and steadily growing. Or medical interests might lead her to being a therapist, a laboratory technician, a hospital administrator.

Public junior colleges, and to some degree private ones, usually adapt themselves to the community or area in which they're located so that what you can get in the way of special courses in a junior college near your home will depend somewhat on your community. If you live in a farm area, the nearest junior college will undoubtedly include courses in animal husbandry, farm machinery, and crop rotation. In the Far West, junior colleges feature the study of mining, forestry, or wildlife conservation.

If your talents lie in the arts, there are junior colleges custom built for you. You can learn theatrical makeup and scenic design, custom design, advertising layout, printing techniques. For you there are jobs in the worlds of music, publishing, theater,

art galleries, museums. Perhaps food attracts you. There are junior colleges that specialize in food courses whose graduates go to work in test kitchens, hotel or restaurant management, cafeteria management, or packaged food industries.

Because of this flexibility, there is no such thing as a typical junior college or a typical course. But let's say you're an art major. You like to paint. You may eventually put this talent to work as an illustrator, advertising artist, occupational therapist, teacher, interior decorator, or any of many other jobs. How would a junior college train you?

The first year you would take such courses as English, psychology, and sociology (since art is man's response to forces within and without, and you had better have an understanding of those forces), probably some mathematics, and then, of course, an introduction to painting techniques and a course in the history of art. You would make field trips to art galleries and museums and see art films. You might visit the studios of artists living nearby. You might take other courses required by your particular college, such as physical education or hygiene.

Your second year would probably be comprised of English literature (which is again related to art), some history and current events, possibly sculpture or music, which would increase your feeling for spatial relationships and mood, and more history of art. And of course many more hours would be spent in actual painting, life classes, sketching trips, techniques.

One important advantage of the junior college is its size—or rather lack of it. Compared with senior colleges most of the 2-year schools are small. Student populations range from less than 50 to 14,000, but the majority are in a 200-to-800 band. This permits not only small classes, where students are encouraged to ask questions, but greater participation by everybody in student activities: councils and governing bodies, planning committees, choral groups, orchestras, dramatic shows, student newspapers, and yearbooks. If campus activities are to be maintained in a junior college, almost everybody has to pitch in. In 4-year colleges, campus activities are often confined to a handful of privileged upperclassmen. To put it bluntly, in a junior college, you can start to be a wheel right away.

More than half of the junior colleges are community supported, and hence they either are free or charge very nominal fees. Tuition at a public junior college may come to \$150 a year, plus books, clothing, and small fees for laboratory courses. Private junior colleges can be as expensive as senior colleges (\$1,500 to \$2,500 a year, including room, board, and necessary personal expenses).

The junior college offers still another benefit if you're a high-school graduate whose future plans are still undetermined. Perhaps you'd like eventually to go on to a 4-year college, but you're not ready yet—you can't afford it, or you feel that you need more academic training in smaller classes, or you recognize honestly that you need another year of growing up before college. Junior college will help you to keep learning while your plans are formulating. If you do transfer to a senior college, you will usually receive full credit for your junior-college courses. Meanwhile the junior college will give you a taste of advanced study and, at the same time, offer a practical alternative if you decide against further schooling. For when you are graduated from junior college, you will receive a degree, evidence of a completed course in a given specialty, on which you can start building a career at once if you wish. Many educators consider that it's better thus to complete a 2-year course than to drop out of a senior college at the end of sophomore year.

It was this concept of a liaison period between high school and college that led originally to the whole concept of junior colleges. The idea was first discussed by university presidents about a hundred years ago, and the earliest actual schools were founded about 1900 in the Middle West. Their original purpose was to provide the first 2 years of university instruction close to home where students could take 2 more years to grow up—something the university thought they needed. This is still a major function of the junior college, and a majority of all its graduates do continue their education at senior colleges.

But other factors soon added to the scope of the junior college's aims, notably the industrial demand for skilled and semiprofessional workers, the growing acceptance of higher education for women, the need in a democracy for a better and better informed citizenry, and increased leisure with a knowledge of how to use it. Today with young people ambitious to make something of themselves and yet wishing to marry young, the junior college is a normal outcome of the democratic way of life. Because of it, educators feel that the time will come when the 2 years of higher education will be routine for everyone.

[From the Atlantic Monthly of July 1957]

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(By Sigurd Rislov)

I

Since the turn of the century, a new educational institution has appeared in America. During the past 20 years, it has grown at an accelerated pace and there are reasons for believing that it will become standard equipment in the Nation's public school program.

This institution is the public 2-year college, sometimes called a junior college, a community college, or just plain college. The typical community college is a local organization, either district or county. Nine-tenths of its students live within a 35-mile radius. There are no fraternities or sororities and usually no dormitories. It boasts small classes, emphasis on teaching, a comprehensive advisory and counseling program for its students, and a personal student-teacher relationship. It undertakes three major functions.

First and paramount is its program of lower division, freshman-sophomore courses paralleling the State university and other senior institutions. Students planning to specialize in any of the regular or academic professional areas, such as law, medicine, dentistry, engineering, teaching, business, psychology, physics, chemistry, botany, can begin college in their own community and transfer with comparable advanced standing to senior institutions for completion of their training without loss of time or credits. About 35 percent of the full-time students in community colleges complete advanced work at a senior institution.

Second, it provides terminal training for students who are not going to be baccalaureate candidates but who want and need more education than high school provides. For these there are such alternatives as trade courses in airframe and aircraft engine mechanics, auto mechanics, radio and television servicing, metal shop, machine shop, or courses for the semiprofessional technician in the various branches of engineering or in laboratories. Some terminal students take business courses, secretarial training, or agriculture. Others take regular lower-division college courses in order to be more knowledgeable persons with broader intellectual and emotional horizons, whatever their occupations.

Besides these two services for the college-age population, the community college at-

tempts to be an educational and cultural reservoir for the adult population of the area. This is its third function and it does this in several ways. One is by providing evening courses for people already employed or in business. The content of such courses is determined by the nature of the group for which they are operated and by interests and wants of the population. There may be classes in modern world problems, history, psychology, philosophy, economics, or whatever interest and facilities warrant. Many of the adults in these classes are college graduates who either want to take those courses which their degree requirements excluded, or want to retake some they once had in order to renew acquaintance with an area of worth to them. Others are without academic degrees, but wish to drink deeper at the Pierian spring.

Another primarily adult service of the community college is to act as a focal point for cultural activities. Do those with musical ability wish to cultivate their talents? The college organizes a chorus, an orchestra, or produces an opera with a local cast. Are there people willing to put forth a concerted effort to make better sense out of current affairs? A college-community forum is organized and leading figures in contemporary problems are brought in to present their views and discuss possible solutions. Comparable assistance can be given to amateur thespians, writers, artists, both in performance and appreciation.

This triadic obligation—to the university-bound student, to the terminal student, and to the adult—is, of course, not assumed by every 2-year college. Some have a highly specialized objective to which all else is legitimately subordinate. What has been described is what appears to be the emerging pattern for the typical public 2-year college.

II

How have communities responded to these functions? If the willingness of the public to tax itself in support of these colleges and to enroll in their courses is an index to public response, then the increase during the past 50 years in both the numbers of colleges and their enrollments is indeed an impressive reply. According to the Junior College Directory for 1957 there were no public 2-year colleges in the United States in 1900. By 1930 there were 178 with 45,021 students enrolled. By 1956 there were 357 and enrollment had reached 680,000. During the latter 26-year period, the increase was about 5 times that of higher education institutions. The trend continues.

Financial support is provided by a combination of student tuition and local and State taxes. S. V. Martorana of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, lists 26 States in which general legislation pertaining to junior colleges exists. Junior colleges are located in 12 other States, some by virtue of special legislation, others without benefit of either special or general legislation. Extensive community college growth has occurred in the Rocky Mountain States, California, Mississippi, Texas, and Washington. The movement is also active in Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

Granted that this institution has had a spectacular reception, what can be said about its future? Is it a temporary aberration from the educational pattern, or will it become standard equipment?

That further adjustments in the educational organization will occur seems reasonably certain. Of the many circumstances causing this, three are of particular importance. One is the continuing high birth-rate of the past dozen years. Most communities are well acquainted with the desperate attempts to provide facilities and teachers for the consequent vast increase in elemen-

tary enrollments. This will, obviously, move on through the secondary school and be reflected on the college level. How much this will affect college enrollments will vary in the different States. For the Nation as a whole, predictions for 1970 indicate an expected increase in all colleges ranging from 70 to 150 percent. Where college facilities are economically and physically available, enrollment increases can be expected to be greater than college-age population increases. For example, enrollment increased 100 percent at Lower Columbia Junior College during the past 6 years, while the college-age population in the area increased only 20 percent. This is representative of trends elsewhere.

Other factors, such as the costs to the student, variety of offerings, military duty, and confidence in the worth of higher education, will influence enrollments. This accounts for some of the differences in predictions. All agree that vast increases will occur.

Another important circumstance is the change in the kinds of work in which our population is employed. Because of the increased use of capital goods in the manufacture of consumer goods, a rapidly increasing proportion of employees are in skilled, technical, and semiprofessional occupations. This increase is occurring not only in industry but in agricultural, governmental, and social-service areas. These positions require more training than is provided in high school, including knowledge and practical operation of relevant basic principles. But they do not require the theoretical background of the professional.

Since the trend toward an increased proportion of employees working in this middle zone promises to continue, it is important that related training be provided not only for students fresh from high school but for those already employed who need to keep pace with developments where they work. Much of this training can best be provided in the classroom.

The third circumstance is the continual need in a democratic society to stimulate the interest of adults in problems of common concern and to add to their knowledge and insight so that they can shape their future wisely. The importance of a well-informed public is taken for granted in our country. Yet we are startled periodically by surveys showing the enormous ignorance of much of the adult population. It is a mistake to believe that after graduation from high school or college the average adult will continue to develop social intelligence. Unless he constantly renews his contact with disciplined thought and replenishes his store of knowledge, he will surely vegetate.

How do these three circumstances—the population surge, occupational trends, and social responsibilities of adults—relate to the future of the community college? The coincidence of the three major functions of the community college with these three circumstances is apparent. In regard to the first, the larger the proportion of high-school graduates who attend community colleges, the less will be the burden on the lower division areas of senior institutions. Without such assistance the senior institutions in some States may well founder.

In regard to the second circumstance, the terminal orientation of part of the community college program makes it especially serviceable. Another local example may best illustrate this. In the spring and summer of 1956, representatives from Weyerhaeuser, Crown Zellerbach, Longview Fibre, and Reynolds Metals worked with our college to plan a 2-year course in maintenance and operation of automatic instruments, and to provide the training equipment needed. This program, now in operation, includes considerable theoretical training beyond high school, such as college physics and chemis-

try; but it also includes extensive shopwork relating theory to operations. Personnel men from relevant industries state that the demand for trained workers in this field will be many times the supply for years to come.

The possibilities for community colleges respecting the third circumstance—social responsibilities of adults—are indicated by the fact that the typical community college enrolls more adults than college-age students. In some instances this ratio is as high as 5 to 1.

Discontinuance of lower division work by the universities may well be a consequence of these developments. Senior institutions are devised for pursuing 4 or more years of academic disciplines. A major purpose of their lower division courses is to prepare for more advanced ones. Yet only about 40 percent of the students entering college complete their baccalaureate. The question has been raised repeatedly whether or not there is considerable lost motion in such situations. As long ago as 1915 Dean Alexis F. Lange of the University of California stated that the university should begin "in the middle of the inherited 4-year scheme."

If it is the case that professors could do better both by their fields and by their students if relieved of much of this lower division work, then there would be grounds for requesting the community college to assume more of that burden. If this is not done, the coming flood of lower division students may necessitate considerable sacrifice of attention to upper division and graduate students and to research.

Community college teachers are consumers of research rather than producers of it. Their task is to keep abreast in their field and to be expert in acquainting beginners with it. They rely on the universities for research. The universities must rely largely on themselves.

Looked at from the student's point of view, a freshman in a senior institution who discovers that a college degree is either not what he wants or not what he is able to acquire has only one recourse—to drop out. In a community college he can shift to a terminal program. His teacher is his adviser whose job includes helping the student enter the field where he belongs.

III

The fact that the pattern described above is well established in California, where student population pressure has been the heaviest, may be a forerunner of developments elsewhere as such pressure becomes comparable. In both numbers and enrollment, California holds undisputed lead with 65 public community colleges enrolling 381,000 students. Spokesmen for some of the senior institutions there urge students to take their lower division work in community colleges, transferring for their upper division work.

Comparative costs of community colleges and senior institutions are another important consideration. These costs are of two types: The cost to the student and the cost to the taxpayer. Unfortunately, the concern of the taxpayer over the costs of education is far out of proportion to the part of his income spent on schools. Americans will spend on all their schools, elementary through university, only about 4½ percent of their income this year. They will spend twice as much on amusements.

However, since costs are of such concern, it is important that they be included in evaluating a public school program. This does not mean that the cheapest is the best, but it does mean that returns on the dollar should be weighed at least as carefully in education as elsewhere.

One way to judge costs would be on the basis of costs per student per year. This method would assume that a student attending a community college for a year

would receive equivalent returns to those which he would have received had he attended a senior institution that year. It also assumes that returns to society would be equivalent in either case. Such studies as have been made indicate that community college students do as well—and in some areas better—in senior institutions to which they transfer as do comparable students entering those institutions directly from high school.

When a community college enables a student to live at home for his first 2 years, his costs are cut in half. This obviously improves his economic opportunity to continue his education elsewhere later.

But what of the costs in the form of taxes? Establishment of community colleges in some States has enabled them to shift some of their higher education costs to the local community, and in some cases also the control. Proponents of the community college are confident that the costs per student per year are much less for the taxpayer, pointing out that they average about one-third those of senior institutions. Such calculations do not include the fact that costs of upper division and graduate courses, plus research, are necessarily far above those of the lower division.

When all allowances have been included, a strong case can be made for the position that a tax dollar will buy more lower division education in the community college than elsewhere.

Although the community college may provide more lower-division education per dollar to the taxpayer as well as to the student, any savings in total tax costs of higher education will be more than offset by the increased number of students who will attend college when one is available near home. Justifying the community college to the taxpayer will consist in the worth of the returns—the lower cost to the student, the increased opportunity to the youth of the community, the returns to society represented by raising the educational level and productivity of those affected, and the additional services that a local college can provide its community—not in lower total taxes.

IV

It would be a mistake to assume that all community colleges bask in sunshine and light. There are hazards here as elsewhere. For example, the urge to show an impressive record of growth and adult service invites expansion beyond the offerings that are warranted. Instances of this have occurred in the recreational field and in providing related training for employment in business or industry when that type of training is best suited for learning on the job. Part of this latter difficulty is due to the fact that not enough is known to make certain just where the line can best be drawn between classroom training and on-the-job training.

Another hazard is the temptation to lower academic standards in university parallel courses. Other colleges, particularly teacher-training institutions, have felt this too, owing to the excessive demand for their graduates. But the community college is peculiarly susceptible because of its commitment to a wider clientele. Usually the only requirements for admission are age 18 or a high-school diploma. Some 75 percent of those entering for the first time as full-time students declare themselves as baccalaureate candidates, while only about 35 percent continue as such. The administrator who wants to serve something to everyone who comes to college has a real problem with those who simply cannot or will not perform at college level.

Under such circumstances there is pressure, in the name of general education, to simplify the subject matter of the courses and to

avoid failing grades. Take the student where he is and start from there. Unfortunately this is often not even within sight of college-level work, and to give degree credit for such performance is obviously a disservice to both the student and higher education. Since the university parallel program is the heart and core of the typical community college, it is essential that it be carried out exceptionally well.

Those students unable to do college work should be directed into terminal programs that are consonant with their ability and interests. If none such are available, the students should be dropped. Holding power is not the sole criterion for a good school. The assumption that the community college can serve the needs of every student who enrolls is absurd.

Hazards are normal conditions confronting every going concern, and those mentioned are obviously not critical. There is no reason to doubt that community colleges will continue to surmount them. Surveys of community college graduates and transfers reveal pronounced enthusiasm on their part for the quality of instruction received in their lower division work.

Will the American public make the community college standard equipment? It is, of course, possible to meet the increased college population with higher admission barriers, economic and scholastic, and thus, by wholesale exclusion, keep the size of enrollments under control. For some colleges with highly specialized objectives this is necessary and desirable. However, a great portion of the American public seems to have accepted the doctrine that a good society is one that provides equal opportunity for all. Where wealth is inherited by succeeding generations, there is some tendency for stable societies to become stratified. One of the consequences of this is that opportunity to share in the fruits of human history, to cultivate one's own capacities, and to use those capacities to do the world's work becomes highly restricted for all but the elect.

In order to encourage equal opportunity it is necessary to develop mechanisms to circumvent or counteract this tendency to rigidity. America has several such mechanisms and values them highly. One of these is tax-supported public education. The ideal persists that through the education route the son or daughter of the poorest illiterate may become a member of the managerial or professional class. Or if his capacities do not permit him to rise to the top, the doctrine requires that enough variety in educational offerings be provided so that, if he will, he can develop his worthwhile talents, whatever they may be.

Besides the concern for equality of opportunity, there is an increased recognition that our society's agencies are too complex to be run by ignoramuses. Extended education is becoming crucial to group welfare. Statements stressing our reliance on educated people are a commonplace.

How seriously this is believed is reflected in the increasing interest in education during the 20th century. For example, although our total population has doubled since 1900, there were 12 times as many high-school graduates in 1950 as in 1900, and 17 times as many college graduates.

This confidence in education as a mechanism for equal opportunity and as a necessity for group welfare, and the fact that the portion of our national income being spent on education is almost trivial, are reasons for believing that educational provisions will be made more available rather than less available to both the Nation's youth and its adults. Since community colleges seem to be the natural point of expansion, it is reasonably certain that their rapid growth will continue in the foreseeable future and that they will become a standard component of the Nation's public-school pattern.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

(By Jesse P. Bogue, executive secretary,
American Association of Junior Colleges)

INTRODUCTION

Many inquiries are being made concerning junior and community colleges. Editors of newspapers and magazines, State and school district officials, and interested citizens are asking for information on basic issues and problems involved in establishing and operating them. During 1957, a considerable number of articles have appeared in national publications on this subject. Far more newspaper editorials have been published during this year than in any half dozen years previously. In view of this widespread interest it seems wise, therefore, to record certain facts and principles of general concern. We trust that our observations may be answers, at least in part, to those who are making inquiries. Special questions will receive individual attention. We are also including a list of references for background information and general understanding of the 2-year college movement.

PRESENT STATUS

There are in the United States and its Territories 625 junior and community colleges. Of these, 361 are controlled by public authority and 264 are independent or church-related. For the academic year 1955-56 they enrolled a grand total of 765,000 students. Approximately 89 percent of the students were attending public institutions.

The rate of gain in enrollments in public community colleges between 1939 and 1954 was greater than in any other part of higher education. During this time, independent and church-related senior colleges and universities made a gain of 76.3 percent; public senior colleges and universities gained 80.9 percent; independent and church-related junior colleges gained 25.7 percent; public community colleges gained 144.4 percent. Gains have been great in some previous periods. For example, from 1921 to 1931 enrollments in all 2-year colleges increased by 9 times; from 1931 to 1941 by 3 times; and from 1941 to 1951 by $2\frac{1}{2}$ times.

Junior and community colleges are classified by the United States Office of Education as higher education. A total of 331 of these institutions are regionally accredited in the category of higher education, of which 221 are under public control and 110 are either independent or church related.

BRIEF HISTORY

There were 6 or 8 two-year colleges organized before 1900. These were all independent or church-related schools. The first public junior college which is still in existence was organized in 1902 at Joliet, Ill. The name "junior college" was coined by William Rainey Harper, first president of the University of Chicago, to designate the first 2 years of the college of arts and sciences. The term was used sometime before 1900. In the 1899 catalog of Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind., the late Ellwood Cubberly, who was president at that time, made the following statement:

"The Vincennes University occupies a unique position in the educational field. It is halfway between the commissioned high school and the full-fledged college; it is in fact a junior college. Its graduates are admitted to junior standing in all the best universities. During the past year Leland Stanford, University of California, Cornell, University of Illinois, and the University of

Indiana have accepted our graduates with junior rank."

The catalogs of this 2-year institution show that collegiate instruction was being given as early as 1883. Research has shown that Lasell Junior College, Auburndale, Mass., offered 2 years of standard collegiate instruction as early as 1852. There is some evidence to indicate that a few institutions, organized now as junior colleges, provided 2 years of college work even before 1850. In any event, the roots of the 2-year college movement run deeply into the 19th century. Presidents Folwell, at the University of Minnesota, Tappan at the University of Michigan, and Harper at Chicago were among strong advocates of what has now become the 2-year college movement, although their concepts were not as clearly defined as the current concept of the movement. The general idea of the 2-year colleges was more sharply defined by educators such as Dean Lange, of the College of Education, University of California, and President James, of the University of Illinois.

The great impetus for the 2-year colleges began in the early 20th century in conjunction with the growing interest in all education. That was the time high-school enrollments started to increase in a spectacular manner; colleges and universities were attracting constantly greater numbers of students. The 2-year college movement is, in many respects, all of a piece with the general upsurge of public interest for more and for different kinds of education.

From about 8 colleges in 1900 the increase was to 207 in the first 30 years; to 493 in the next 10 years; and to 635 in 1956. The greatest expansions during the past 10 years have been in average enrollments rather than in the number of new colleges. While many junior colleges are still comparatively small, the average size for the private colleges is about 325 students, and the public is nearly 1,900. There are 13 public institutions each with an enrollment in excess of 10,000.

Expansions in the number of colleges and in enrollments have been the result of the increasing public awareness of their unique functions. Originally, these institutions were regarded as means to provide 2 years of liberal arts and sciences. As time went on it became clear that there were many community needs that could be met by the organization of curricula designed for requirements in business, industry, agriculture, education, health, and other types of services. It was observed that half of all students who entered colleges and universities did not survive beyond the sophomore year. Therefore, well-organized 2-year curricula in general and vocational-technical education seemed to be a better solution for the further education of many students. Moreover, adult education became a growing function in these colleges about the mid-1930's. Since that time, enrollments of special, part-time students in the adult-age brackets have been very great.

Through the years, by experimental programs of various kinds, by ever-increasing awareness to the needs of people in their home communities, and by the proven result of satisfactory educational work, persons in public community colleges now see clearly their functions as (a) university parallel and preprofessional studies for 2 years, (b) general and vocational-technical education of from 1 to 3 years, (c) short courses and specialized programs to upgrade and retrain employed persons, (d) courses for adults either for credit or noncredit in almost any field of education for which enough people show an interest to warrant the formation of classes.

At this point the community college emerges. It is generally located within commuting distance of its students. Ordinarily, it is controlled by the people of the commu-

nity through their elected officials. As a rule, it is partially or wholly supported by the community. It is especially sensitive to community needs. Here we may observe some difference between a junior college with its main emphasis on the liberal arts and preprofessional programs and a community college with its broader offerings primarily oriented to the needs of a particular community. And while the main emphasis of most junior colleges, either public or private, may be in liberal arts and preprofessional studies, many of them provide organized occupational curriculums to prepare graduates for immediate employment, or for homelife.

The multiple-purpose, or comprehensive, community college has appeared as a result of changing economic, technological, and social conditions of the present century. These changes are too well known to be stated here. Our whole economy and the manner in which our national security must be maintained are requiring an ever-increasing number of people who are far better educated and trained than in any previous time in our history. It is believed by many people that nearly one-half of all high-school graduates can profit by at least 2 years of instruction beyond high school, and that the times we are living in make it mandatory that they secure this education. One dominant characteristic of our present society is its insatiable demand for constantly increasing percentages of well educated and trained people. Our greatest and most critical short supply now is personnel of this kind, not alone in the highest ranks of ability, but also in the middle-level ranks of those who assist professional workers.

The United States Office of Education became actively interested in the 2-year colleges sometime before 1919. In that year, it published the Junior College, by F. M. McDowell. The following year it took the lead in calling a meeting which resulted in the organization of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Since 1948, a specialist in junior community college education has carried out his functions through the Division of Higher Education. The position is now held by Dr. S. V. Martorana and plans have been made to add another specialist to the staff. By 1957, there were 16 States in which either a full-time or part-time State director of junior-college education had been appointed.

THE PLACE OF 2-YEAR COLLEGES

In the brief history we have indicated that certain basic forces have been operating to bring the 2-year college movement to its present place in American education. The constant upward thrust of educational offerings in response to the demands of the people has been an important factor. Free, universal, public education through the 12th year has been firmly established in every State. In California the 14th year has been established as free education in public junior colleges. In Mississippi and a few other States tuition is free or very low. Will public junior-college education in time become as free and available as high-school education today? There are indications that it will as a result of the requirements of our complex, technological society and the demands of the public that every individual shall have an opportunity to continue appropriate education.

Two-year community colleges are being established to help students overcome certain well-recognized barriers standing between them and education beyond high school. One barrier is lack of finances. When young people can live at home and attend tuition free, or for the payment of modest fees, the economic barrier is lowered. Another barrier closely related to finances is geography. It is being lowered by bringing the colleges

¹ The term "community" refers almost entirely to public institutions, although many 2-year public colleges carry the name "junior." Our main emphasis throughout these observations will be on the public colleges in view of the inquiries we are receiving and which we wish to answer.

to the people. Lack of desire to continue education is a barrier, and it, too, is frequently related to financial conditions and geographical locations. A fourth barrier is lack of sufficiently diversified course offerings in higher education to meet the varieties of needs of students and their occupational outlets. It is being overcome by means of the multiple purpose, comprehensive community college. Naturally, scholarships, opportunities to earn some part of college expenses, and the geographical locations of senior colleges and universities as well as the 2-year colleges play a very important role in college attendance.

It might be asked, Why 2-year colleges? Why not establish 4-year colleges within commuting distance of most students? This plan would be beyond the financial ability of the public and, moreover, 2 years of education beyond high school is initially sufficient for a considerable percentage of high-school graduates. For example, President Glennan of Case Institute of Technology is quoted as having stated in a recent address that "from 50 to 75 percent of the work being done in engineering departments of manufacturing plants can be done as well, if not better, by engineering technicians who graduate from 2-year technical colleges, rather than from 4-year universities." What is true with respect to technicians is equally applicable to a host of semiprofessional occupations in nearly every kind of business, the health services, and various other kinds of employment. The 2-year colleges, therefore, have a definite place in the preparation of personnel for these types of services.

A great deal of public attention is being given to community colleges now because of increasing numbers of students who are seeking to enter higher education. Two-year colleges can and no doubt will provide for a larger percentage of these students in future years than is the case now. They would, however, have continued to expand in numbers of institutions and in enrollments even if there had been no crisis in the colleges. They are not emergency institutions. They have a definite place in the comprehensive plans for higher education in States where adequate consideration has been given to the adoption of educational policies. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School states that they are "filling in and rounding out our educational system." The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association views their place in these words: "Not bound to the 4-year tradition, ordinarily sensitive to local needs and conditions and aspirations, these institutions have an increasingly important role in higher education."

The Higher Education Commission of Illinois in 1957 found that 2-year public colleges can do the following for that State:

1. Provide additional educational opportunities for all high school graduates.
2. Relieve freshman and sophomore congestion in 4-year colleges and universities.
3. Reduce costs for the first and second years of higher education.
4. Reduce the costs for the individual and his family for higher education.
5. Provide the student a means of finding himself and his vocational or professional objective while living at home.
6. Encourage the enrollment of more of the top half of high school graduates who are not now going to college.
7. Meet the local needs of agriculture, business and industry for better educated and trained manpower in the community.

At the dedication of Bakersfield (California) College's \$10 million plant in October 1956, President Sproul of the University of California said: "The institution we honor tonight is a shining example of the part that a junior college can play in a State's educational system—not only by lightening

the burden of swollen enrollments in State colleges and the State university, but also and primarily by making education beyond high school graduation available to boys and girls who might otherwise be denied this priceless opportunity."

This great educator further stated in his address: "I would today urge high school graduates to attend junior colleges unless there is a compelling reason for them to go to a 4-year college away from home such as, for example, absence in the local course offerings of prerequisites for a career that the student has chosen as his educational objective."

The place of the 2-year college is further confirmed by the statement and recommendations of the New York State Board of Regents of December 21, 1956: "2-year comprehensive community colleges, characterized by low cost to the student, geographical availability and direct responsiveness to community needs, offering both transfer and technical-terminal programs, are considered to be the best single means of (a) accommodating future demands for higher education, (b) embracing the increasing heterogeneity of abilities represented in the students graduating from secondary schools and (c) providing the education necessary for an emerging group of semiprofessional occupations. Community colleges have a meaning and a competence in their own right. They can provide as well as technical-terminal education, competent pre-professional and general education instruction."

Greater attention is being focused on the place of 2-year colleges now because increasing numbers of students are seeking higher education. Doors of opportunity are being closed from lack of space. Some institutions are unable or unwilling to make extensive expansions of facilities. Costs to attend college away from home are mounting year by year. There are trends in a good many independent senior colleges and universities toward stricter policies for admissions of students. In some States pressures are being applied on State colleges and universities by taxpayers because their sons and daughters are being denied admission from lack of space to accommodate them. These factors are present and real. They will inevitably become more impressive during the next few years.

Now, while the conditions listed in the foregoing paragraph are focusing greater attention on the place of 2-year colleges, their place in higher education is being more fully confirmed by other reasons. The requirements of our complex society and our technological economy can be met successfully only as the level of education and training is raised for larger numbers and greater percentages of the population. The belief that every individual shall have an opportunity for appropriate education is being felt more and more throughout the Nation. There are demands for greater diversification in education beyond high school to match the different kinds of abilities of our youth and to prepare them for more effective employment, citizenship, and home life. There are trends toward the adoption of comprehensive State plans and policies in higher education in the several States, providing for a reasonable division of functions among various kinds of institutions. In this division of functions, community colleges have a definite place as an integral part of higher education that can be provided at a price the people can afford to pay.

PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

If we may assume that 2-year colleges have "a competence in their own right," that they are an integral part of American higher education, that they "fill in and round out the system of higher education," what steps should be taken to plan for and establish them? Based on experiences of States and

communities where they are successful, we would suggest the following guidelines:

1. Each State as a whole should be concerned about a comprehensive plan for a statewide system. Attention should be given to those areas where opportunities are not provided for higher education. Duplication of facilities and effort should be avoided. The kind of college already established must be considered. If it is for one sex only, if it has stiff requirements for admission, if its tuition is high, if its offerings are restricted to the liberal arts only or to some other type of education, then the question can be legitimately raised as to how well this college is meeting the diversity of needs in the community. The mere fact that a college is there, may not be the final determining factor. For example, if there is a college preparatory school for boys in a community, does it necessarily follow that a high school should not be established? Certainly not, because this type of school does not pretend to meet the needs of all secondary students in the community.

2. There should be well-defined authority lodged by legal enactment in a central agency of the State whose duties are to carry out State surveys and work with local communities to determine (a) resources for supporting a college at reasonable tax rates, (b) probable number of students who would be best served by a college, (c) needs in the community for various kinds of educational programs, (d) willingness of the people to support a college and, (e) geographical conditions of the proposed territory for commuting purposes for the great majority of students.

3. Legislation should be enacted to authorize (a) the establishment of community colleges, (b) legal tax rates which may be levied for capital and current expenditures, (c) designation of control, (d) the amount of support which will be supplied by the State, (e) amount of tuition which may be charged, (f) authority to issue bonds for construction, (g) methods by which junior-college districts may be created, and (h) the authority of school districts without junior colleges to pay for students to attend in districts that have them. If a vote of the people is required to establish the college, the method should be determined by the State.

4. We recommend that (a) a community college be locally controlled, (b) have its own campus and facilities, (c) have its own faculty of well-qualified college teachers who understand the place of the community college and are dedicated to this type of education, (d) have its own budget and financial structure, and its formula for determination of costs, (e) have clearly defined and well-understood programs of basic services, and (f) have the advantages of occupational advisory committees from local employer and employee groups.

In respect to the foregoing principles, it may not be possible in the initial stages to make provision for all of these recommendations. Some facilities may need to be shared, such as, for example, athletic fields, gymnasium, auditorium, and cafeteria. The college, however, should have its own library, classrooms, laboratories, student center, administrative, and faculty offices if it is expected that a good job is to be done in an atmosphere of college teaching. The community college should not be an appendage of the school system, or of a university. We do not send high-school students to an elementary-school building in the late afternoon and at night. We cannot send college students to a high-school plant as a permanent policy in the late afternoon and at night and expect to achieve the best results. Even the sharing of facilities for daytime classes should be reduced to a minimum and eliminated as soon as possible.

We do not claim that good work has not been done by junior colleges in association

with secondary schools. Records are to the contrary. Our claim is that this association is a handicap and should not, therefore, be adopted as a long-term policy. Junior colleges should be established in those communities where resources and the number of students will in time be sufficient to provide for an independent operation. The atmosphere of the institution, methods of instruction, policies for discipline, student government, and extracurricular activities for the college-age group are far more favorable when the junior college is established and operated in its own right. It has been widely observed that the willingness of high-school graduates to attend a junior college locally is greatly improved when the college has its own campus, facilities, and faculty.

5. We strongly recommend that (a) expert consulting services be secured when a community proposes to establish a college, (b) ample time be taken for thorough planning, organization, providing for faculty and administration, library, and other necessary facilities so that good work may be accomplished from the beginning, and (c) provision be made for student personnel services in testing, counseling and guidance, placement, and followup. The first 2 years of college are highly important and frequently critical. This is the time when choices are often made for vocational or professional objectives, habits of study, and conduct confirmed, and life companionships determined.

6. We recommend that communities proposing to establish a college should examine the criteria and standards for regional accreditation. We do not imply that a college can expect to qualify for accreditation when it is founded. It takes time to reach this goal. However, authorities should look to the future to achieve this goal as rapidly as possible. Standards for junior colleges have been defined by each of the six regional accrediting associations—New England, North Central, Middle Atlantic States, Southern, Northwest, and the Western Associations of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The problems of financing junior colleges cannot be solved easily nor by categorical recommendations. Costs for this type of education vary from one institution to another, even within the same State where they are being operated under State supervision. However, some general bench marks may be indicated as guides for States and communities. Much depends on the kind of facilities proposed and the quality of education to be provided.

The Needs of Higher Education in Maryland, 1955, indicates that, "The cost of building classroom facilities for college students is estimated to be approximately \$3,000 per student." The site, size, and location of the college plant are very important. It has been recommended in California that, "there be provided a minimum site of 30 acres plus an additional acre for each 100 pupils of ultimate enrollment." Experience has shown that this formula, recommended a few years ago, is probably insufficient for satisfactory space. One item for a community college must be carefully considered, namely, space for parking automobiles. Serious consideration is being given in California now to provide parking space for one automobile for each full-time student.

Dr. C. C. Colvert, of the University of Texas, an authority on junior college administration and finance, estimates that the minimum space per student for classrooms and other educational facilities is 125 square feet, the average about 130, and the optimum 143, or above. By determining the amount of space needed in a community college per full-time student, and by estimating the cost locally per square foot for constructing the kind of facilities required in that community, committees can arrive at a fairly accurate figure. The kind of buildings required in North

Dakota, for example, will differ from those needed in Florida. There are some variations in costs per square foot for the same kind of facilities in different sections of the country.

Dr. Colvert, in planning with authorities in one Southern State, projected this formula: "At \$15 per square foot it comes out that it costs about \$1 per square foot per student to build buildings and pay for them with bonds over a period of 20 years. In other words, if it is decided to provide 135 square feet per student, then that amounts to \$135 per student per year for 20 years." He states if there are 500 students provided for, \$67,500 must be placed in the budget each year for 20 years to retire the bonds. One of the advantages of the community college is the continuing use of its buildings from 8 o'clock in the morning until 10 at night, 5 days a week, and for 12 months in the year. Evening classes are designed largely for adults who are employed during the daytime.

The costs for current operations, as we have previously mentioned, vary from State to State and for colleges within the same State. The Maryland studies indicate that at least \$600 per full-time student per academic year should be provided. California, which has more junior colleges than any other State and which has had a long experience with them, finds that per student operating costs vary from \$318.05 to \$665.06 (as of the year 1952-53). The cost per student in average daily attendance per academic year in Los Angeles for 7 junior colleges in 1952-53 was \$426.19.

Much depends on the size of the college because there are some overhead constant expenditures necessary for a college of almost any size. Estimates of minimum size vary with authorities. We believe that a community college should plan to have 400 full-time students to operate at a reasonable cost and provide for the variety of offerings required. It is practically impossible to estimate what optimum numbers should be. However, one county in one of our States has adopted a policy of limiting enrollments in any one community college to approximately 1,000 full-time day students. If and when larger numbers must be educated more colleges will be established.

HOW COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE FINANCED

The manner in which community colleges are financed differs considerably from State to State. We shall not outline in detail the ways finances are provided in all States. The following examples, however, may provide guidelines for a general understanding. A thorough study of this subject is being made by Dr. S. V. Martorana and Dr. Clayton Hutchins of the United States Office of Education. The report should be available within the year 1957. It will deal in considerable detail with the problems of financing junior colleges and give special attention to sources of income. In view of the fact that this report is not available now, we are listing a few of the States and indicating how their community colleges are financed.

Arizona provides from the State \$150,000 per year for each of its junior colleges. Additional support is derived from local taxes and tuitions.

California appropriates a minimum of \$120 per year per student in average daily attendance. There is an equalizing formula which guarantees a minimum of \$385 per year per student from State and local finances. If a local levy of 35 cents on the \$100 of assessed valuation plus \$120 from the State does not equal \$385, the State makes up the difference. There are no tuitions. Hence, major support is derived from local taxes. As yet the State does not appropriate funds for capital outlay.

Colorado provides from State funds \$1,050 per year per teaching unit of 7 students. The remainder of current expenses is sup-

plied by local taxes and tuition. Capital funds are provided by local taxes.

Florida is providing all funds for capital developments from the State and about \$400 per year per student for current operations. The remainder of current funds come from tuition and local taxes. The 1957 legislature appropriated \$12 million for capital and current funds.

Illinois pays \$200 per year per student for current expenses; no funds for capital outlay. Districts without junior colleges may by vote of the people pay tuition for students attending junior colleges in districts which have them. Local taxes and tuitions are the major sources of support.

Iowa provides \$180 per year per student, but no capital funds. Tuitions and local taxes provide for the major part of the expenses.

Maryland has a general understanding that one-third of the funds for current expenses will come from the State, one-third from the county, and one-third from tuition. The State appropriation, however, has seldom been equal to one-third of the current costs. No funds are provided for capital developments.

Michigan pays from State funds \$190 per year per student. In 1957 the State appropriated \$1,200,000 for capital funds. Local taxes and tuitions make up the difference.

Minnesota passed its first State appropriation in 1957 for \$200 per year per student. Funds for capital outlay and for the major support for current operations are provided by local taxes and tuitions.

Mississippi's appropriations for current support amount to approximately \$200 per year per student. Some funds have been provided from the State for capital improvements and for the purchase of technical equipment. The total biennium appropriation for 1956-58 was \$4,330,000 for 15 colleges.

New York pays from State funds one-half of capital expenses and one-third for current operations. The other two-thirds for current expenditures is divided equally between the sponsoring district and tuitions for the present 12 community colleges. There are six 2-year agricultural and technical institutes entirely supported from State funds. This State proposes to spend \$56 million for capital developments, matched by local funds. Several more community colleges are to be established.

North Carolina made its first State appropriations in 1957. For current support \$3 per quarter credit hour will be paid for students who are residents of the State taking regular college courses, or technical-terminal programs; \$1,500,000 was appropriated for capital outlay to be matched by local funds.

Texas has appropriated \$240 per student per year for the first 350 and \$185 per year per student for all in excess of this number. The average is approximately \$206 from State funds. The total 1957-59 biennium appropriation is \$9,440,000 for current operations. The remainder is provided by local taxes and low tuitions. All capital funds are provided locally. There are two State 2-year colleges which derive all of their funds from the State with the exception of income from tuitions.

Washington State appropriates more than \$300 per year per student for current operations; the remainder is provided locally by taxes and low tuitions. The State also provides finances for capital construction. The percentage varies somewhat from district to district for capital funds. Sometimes the amount from the State may be as high as 75 percent of the total cost. The size of the junior college district is one of the determining factors.

There are other States which are giving support to the junior colleges such as, for example, in Utah where all capital finances

are appropriated by the State, and the State's share for current operations is by direct legislative action. There are no local taxes. Low tuitions are charged. Five 2-year colleges in Georgia and 8 in Oklahoma are supported on the same basis as those in Utah.

There is a definite trend toward greater support from the States both for current operations and capital outlay. If community colleges are to assume a larger share of responsibility for higher education, they must be more liberally supported from State funds. Quality education, whether in a 4-year or a 2-year college, requires adequate financing. Youth who attend 2-year colleges deserve as good education as those who attend 4-year institutions.

WHAT DO COMMUNITY COLLEGES TEACH?

The vast majority of community colleges teach the regular first 2 years in arts and sciences, including engineering and other technical curricula. A considerable number of them provide the first 2 years in teacher education, music and the other fine arts, and various curricula in the fields of business. These are called university parallel programs because they match in most respects the programs given during the first 2 years in senior colleges and universities. Included in these studies are prerequisites for the first 2 years of the professions such as, for example, medicine, dentistry, and law.

Community colleges also offer organized occupational curricula, primarily designed for the completion of formal education for employment, or for home living. What a particular college offers in these programs is largely determined by local surveys of business, agriculture, industry, the healing arts, and by consulting services of occupational advisory committees. These programs are flexible and adaptable in terms of the needs of the community. An example of 2-year programs now offered by some community colleges is nursing. Experimental programs during the past few years have demonstrated that an efficient bedside nurse can be educated in 2 years and fully qualified to pass State examinations.

Community colleges provide for short courses of study and training in many fields to retrain and upgrade employed persons. Some of them teach almost any worthy subject anytime to anyone when there are enough qualified people interested to justify the offering and when a good teacher may be secured.

Community colleges are doing an extensive job in adult education. Each college should make careful and continuing studies of its own community and determine for itself what it can and should do. It should be sensitive and oriented to the needs of its students and those of its community.

HOW GOOD ARE COMMUNITY COLLEGES?

Community colleges vary in terms of the extent and the quality of work they are doing as is the case with 4-year colleges. It is practically impossible to make any sweeping statement that will cover all institutions. Some are excellent, others are mediocre, and still others poor. However, as of 1957 over two-thirds of the public community colleges are regionally accredited. Certainly, this is a good record in achievement for a group of relatively new collegiate institutions.

Studies have been made regarding the records of community college graduates who have continued in senior colleges, professional, and graduate schools. Let us look at 2 or 3 of them that cover enough time and sufficient numbers of students to give reliable data. Minnesota's Stake in the Future, 1956, contains the following observation:

"Minnesota junior colleges have made an enviable record in many respects. During the 1914-56 period the public junior colleges have educated 55,343 regular day stu-

dents as well as additional thousands of adults. Many of these students have gone on to senior college and graduate school and have succeeded very well. Studies of transfers to the University dating back to 1929 and up to the present show that the transfers from junior college on the average do as well or better than students taking all their work at the university.

"This conclusion was well documented by a recent doctoral study which showed that the preengineering programs in private, teachers', and junior colleges were fully as effective as programs completed entirely within the institute of technology at the university. Of the transfer institutions, junior colleges had the highest percentage of their students complete a 2-year program before transfer, transfer students from these institutions remained in engineering programs the longest period of time, and attained the best academic records."

Let us look at a recent sampling from California. Dr. Roy Simpson, superintendent of public instruction for that State, reported a study in October 1956. Here are his words:

"Over the 5-year period, 1951-55, the junior colleges graduated more than 50,000 students of whom almost a quarter (24.51 per cent) transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, or Santa Barbara. A study of the performance of junior college transfers entering the junior year at Berkeley in the fall of 1951 has been prepared by the office of relations with schools. Comparison was made between the persistence and achievement of junior college transfers and native students likewise entering the junior year in 1951. Junior college transfers who at the time they enrolled in junior college would have been eligible for admission to the University of California completed their fourth or senior year at Berkeley in the same proportion (77.9 percent) as students who had in 1951 entered the university as freshmen. They even had a slightly higher grade-point average overall (1.80 as compared with 1.73 for native students). Clearly the junior colleges as a whole provide satisfactory preparation for upper division studies and do as good a job as the university in the instance of students whose high school preparation met university requirements for admission."

The group of students referred to by Dr. Simpson represented about 40 percent of the transfers, namely, those who could have entered the university directly from high school. Another group, representing about 60 percent of the transfers, did not qualify for admission to the university before entering junior colleges. Their persistence was even greater than either the native students or of the better qualified transfers. They graduated in the regular time schedule, although their achievement was not as high as either of the other groups. The grade point average was 1.59. In the University of California a grade point of 1=C, 2=B, 3=A.

Many other examples of achievement of junior college graduates could be given. A rather thorough study of this matter is being made by Dr. Leland L. Medsker at the University of California under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It is expected that results will be published sometime in 1958. Persons who have a further interest in the junior-college movement will find valuable information in the references we are listing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Junior College Journal, James W. Reynolds, editor. Published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. nine times the year September through May. \$3.50, 64 pages and cover. Twenty-eighth volume begins September 1957.

Junior College Newsletter, Jesse P. Bogue, editor. Published 12 times the year by the American Association of Junior Colleges, \$2.

Junior College Directory, Jesse P. Bogue, editor. Published annually by the association, \$1. Contains important information about all junior colleges.

American Junior Colleges, fourth edition, 1956, Jesse P. Bogue, editor. Published by The American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., 569 pages, \$8.

Founding of Public Junior Colleges, Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr., Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1954. One hundred and thirty-six pages and references. Shows how local interest and initiative resulted in establishment of 6 community colleges.

The Community College, Jesse P. Bogue, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1950. Three hundred and seventy-seven pages, \$6.50. An overview of the rise and development of junior and community colleges in the United States.

History of Mississippi Junior Colleges, a State System of Public Junior Colleges, Knox M. Broom, 90 pages, \$1. State Department of Education, Jackson, Miss.

The Public Junior College, B. Lamar Johnson, editor. National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1956. Three hundred and thirty-eight pages including excellent selected references.

Industry-College Relations, Edward Hodnutt. World Publishing Co., Cleveland and New York, 1955. One hundred and fifty-eight pages. Section 21 on junior colleges.

A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California, Liaison Committee of the California State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, 1957. California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

Statement and Recommendations by the Board of Regents for Meeting the Needs of Higher Education in New York State, December 21, 1956. Twenty-two pages, State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y.

Minnesota's Stake in the Future, Higher Education 1956-70, Report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education, 1956. Ninety-eight pages, State Department of Education, 301 State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn.

Meeting Ohio's Needs in Higher Education, John Dale Russell, director. The Ohio College Association, J. Garber Drushal, executive secretary, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, 1956. One hundred and twenty pages, \$1.

Higher Education in a Decade of Decision, Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1957. Cloth \$2, paper bound, \$1.50.

The Needs of Higher Education in Maryland, report of the commission appointed by Governor McKeldin, 1955. State Department of Education, Baltimore. One hundred and twenty-seven pages.

Higher Education and Florida's Future, Recommendations and General Staff Report, volume 1, 1956. Seventy-six pages. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, Fla., \$1.50.

Florida's New Community Junior Colleges, fifth annual Junior College Conference, 1957. Forty pages. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

High School Seniors and Their Plans, A Study of the Educational Plans of High School Seniors in Florida, 1956. Bulletin No. 7. Community College Council, Tallahassee, Fla. Fifty pages and appendix.

Illinois Looks to the Future in Higher Education, A Summary of the Report of the Higher Education Commission to the Governor and Legislature of the State of Illinois, 1957. Two hundred and eighteen pages. Daniel McMaster, director, Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago, Ill.

First Interim Report to the President, President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, 1956. Twelve pages. The President's Committee on Education Beyond High

School, United States Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C.

The Citadel of Learning, James Bryant Conant, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1956. Seventy-nine pages.

The Technical Institute, Smith and Lipsett, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1956. Three hundred and seven pages, \$5.

An Agenda and Source Materials for the Junior College Study Commission, the State Board of Education for Texas, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1956. Mimeographed.

The Public Junior Colleges of Texas, a general report for the academic year, 1954-55. Texas Education Agency, Austin. Fifty-nine pages. Mimeographed.

Texas Public Junior College Laws, Texas Council of Public Junior Colleges, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1956. One hundred and seventy pages. Mimeographed.

Pamphlets available through the American Association of Junior Colleges

A Major Policy Pronouncement Regarding Junior College Education, Robert Gordon Sproul, University of California. Thirteen pages, \$3 per 100.

The Future of Junior Colleges in California, Roy E. Simpson, superintendent of Public Instruction, State of California. Eight pages, \$3 per 100.

The Place of Junior College Education in the Future of Our Country, Arthur S. Adams, president, American Council on Education. Ten pages, \$3 per 100.

Shall I Attend a Junior College? Edward F. Mason. Sixteen pages, \$2.50 per 100.

I Will Never Regret Junior College, Raymond A. Crippen. Four pages, \$1.50 per 100.

Brochure on 2-Year Colleges, fully illustrated, 16 pages. Two colors, 25 cents each.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2812) to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, August 6, 1957.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House
of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:
DEAR MR. SPEAKER:

The Department recommends to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of legislation to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska.

This proposed legislation undertakes to accomplish the same objective as S. 742 introduced in the 84th Congress and passed in

the Senate on May 9, 1955. The proposed bill would improve the administration of the airports operated by the Department of Commerce at Fairbanks and Anchorage, Alaska, in these respects:

1. It would authorize the establishment of an effective local police force on these two Government reservations; and

2. It would place the operations of the airports on a more businesslike basis by establishing an Alaskan airports fund through which airport income would be applied to costs of maintaining, operating, and improving the airport.

The two airports include substantial tracts of land—1,815 acres at Anchorage, and 1,631 acres at Fairbanks—roads, installations, buildings, and equipment, with a value of about \$15,600,000. During the past 4 years, activity at these airports has grown rapidly. There has been a 130-percent increase in originating passengers and a 30-percent increase in aircraft operations. There is a substantial amount of private flying activity, irregular operations, and bush pilot flying at both airports. These facts indicate that the airports are busy communities with substantial need for police protection. Both of the airports are outside the city limits of the municipalities from which they derive their names and are thus outside the jurisdiction of the local police. Under section 4 of the Organic Act of the Airports (act of May 28, 1948), control over, responsibility for, and the care and protection of the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports are functions of the Department of Commerce. The discharge of this responsibility requires the exercise of correlative authority to engage in normal police activities. At present the Secretary of Commerce has no such authority. The proposed new section 10 for the Organic Act of the Airports, in the enclosed draft, would provide the Secretary of Commerce with authority:

1. To appoint uniformed, armed police officers to serve at the airports;

2. To permit such police officers to make arrests on the airports; and

3. To permit the commanding police officers to require violators of the rules and regulations of the airports to deposit collateral for appearance in court.

This authority is identical with that presently exercised by the Secretary of Commerce at Washington National Airport, and that normally granted to other officials responsible for furnishing police protection of Federal reservations.

Section 11 of the Organic Act of the Airports, as proposed in the enclosed draft, would establish an Alaskan airports fund for the deposit of income derived from the operation of the airports. All airport activities including maintenance, operation, police protection and capital improvements would be financed from the fund. Under the present financing arrangements, airport expenses are financed out of appropriated funds and revenues derived from the operation of the airport are deposited in miscellaneous receipts. Under the proposed financing arrangements appropriations would be required to supplement revenues only when out-of-pocket costs exceed the amount available in the fund. Estimated revenues will permit funding of maintenance and operating costs and interest payments on invested capital. In the future it is expected that revenues will permit funding of depreciation as appropriations are not required for this purpose. Therefore, normally no appropriations will be needed except for major capital improvements.

Establishment of the fund would appear to be generally consistent with the objectives now sought by the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department, under their joint program for improving financial management in the Federal Government, especially in business-type enterprises such as these airports,

and in addition, would provide the flexibility needed to meet and adjust quickly to changing requirements that operations of this type demand. For instance, increased costs of providing services to the public and to airport tenants and concessionaires, such as increased use of or higher rates for utilities, which the airport management cannot anticipate and over which it has no control, must be financed under the present system from the airport appropriation. Even though these costs are passed on to users the money thus derived cannot be used to reimburse the appropriation but must be turned over to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Obviously, the end result is that other airport services must be curtailed.

Similarly, provision of added space or facilities for concessionaires, to permit them to accommodate the needs of air carriers and the traveling public, must be delayed until additional appropriations can be secured. These delays and curtailments not only result in inadequate service to the traveling public and other airport users, but also may prevent the airport from undertaking new profit-making activities.

The Bureau of the Budget, in its report on the Government's Alaskan business activities submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations at its request on January 14, 1953 (H. Rept. No. 2316, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), stated in part:

"An airport is a complex business enterprise. A wide variety of services must be furnished to airlines, concessionaires, and the traveling public.

"The operation of the landing area is only one aspect of airport management. It is generally acknowledged that if an airport is to be self-sustaining, all sources of potential revenue must be fully exploited, including sale of power, water, and other utilities, concessions for restaurants, stores, fuel handling, and other services. To function with maximum effectiveness, an airport requires much the same flexibility as any other business activity. The Alaska international airports do not have this flexibility and are treated with respect to financing, budget, accounts and audit in exactly the same way as a governmental program with none of the characteristics of a business.

"Present laws and regulations applicable to the airports are not conducive to sound business management. For example, the Government may be placed in a position where it has to lose money for the sake of economy. All funds for the airports are provided from appropriations. Revenues are paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. * * * Management has little or no incentive vigorously to seek increased revenue, when the net effect is to deplete the amount of appropriations available for other purposes."

The report recommended the establishment of an Alaskan airport revolving fund to provide necessary flexibility.

The proposed section 11 in the draft would implement the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Commerce concurs in the recommendation and urges early and favorable consideration by the Congress of the enclosed proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the submittal of this proposal to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY— AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an agreement for cooperation with the Government of Spain, together

with accompanying correspondence. This is the unclassified power agreement for cooperation, signed on August 16, 1957, and received at the Joint Committee on August 16, 1957. It provides for the transfer of 500 kilograms of contained uranium 235.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1957.

HON. CARL T. DURHAM,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United
States.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there is submitted with this letter:

1. Three copies of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of Spain;
2. Three copies of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement;
3. Three copies of a letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

The agreement for cooperation submitted with this letter will incorporate and supersede the agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy which was signed on July 19, 1955, between the two Governments, and will remain in force for a period of 10 years. It will broaden the scope of cooperation on matters relating to the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors; by providing for cooperation on health and safety problems related to the operation and use of such reactors; and by providing for cooperation on the use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry. No restricted data will be exchanged under the agreement.

Article VI would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Article VIII of the agreement will permit the Commission to sell or lease, as may be agreed, to the Government of Spain uranium, enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent in the isotope U-235, except as noted below, in such quantities as may be agreed, for fueling defined reactor projects in Spain; provided, however, that the net amount of any uranium sold or leased during the period with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235. The Commission at its discretion may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. The Spanish contemplate the purchase of a power reactor in 1958 or 1959, and a research reactor purchased from a United States firm will probably be delivered by the end of this year. As in the case of sale transactions, the agreement, in the event of lease, would permit the retention by the Government of Spain of special nuclear materials produced in fuel elements obtained from the United States. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of Spain for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel

elements are radioactively cooling in Spain or while fuel elements are in transit.

The agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in either Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission. In addition, article X of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In article XII the parties affirm their interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to this end express their willingness to reappraise the agreement in the light of the establishment of the Agency, upon the request of either party.

The agreement will enter into force when the two governments have exchanged written notification that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

Enclosures: (1) Three copies of agreement for cooperation with Spain; (2) three copies of AEC letter to President; (3) three copies of President's letter to Commission.

AUGUST 2, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled: "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," and authorize its execution.

The agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Spain in accordance with the policy you have established. The agreement, which will extend for a period of 10 years, will broaden the scope of cooperation between Spain and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation on matters relating to the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors. It is expected that the parties will exchange information in other unclassified areas including health and safety problems related to the operation and use of such reactors.

Spain, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors, and private industry of the United States will be able, under this agreement, to render other assistance to Spain. The agreement contains all the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell or lease, as may be agreed, to the Government of Spain, uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent in the isotope U-235, except as noted below, in such quantities as may be agreed, for fueling defined reactor projects in Spain; provided, however, that the net amount of any uranium sold or leased, during the period of the agreement does not exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235. The Commission, at its discretion, may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235

in uranium. At the present time it is expected that the U-235 to be transferred to Spain will be employed in a power demonstration reactor and in a research reactor. As in the case of sale transactions, in the event of lease, the agreement would permit the retention by the Government of Spain of special nuclear material produced in fuel elements obtained from the United States.

The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of Spain for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling or, subject to Commission approval, are being reprocessed in Spain.

Article VI of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear material, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Article VIII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed either in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission. In addition, article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to this end express their willingness to reappraise the agreement in the light of the establishment of the Agency, upon the request of either party.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain and placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

Enclosure: Agreement for cooperation with Spain.

Certified to be a true copy of the original:
A. L. GAMSON,
United States Atomic Energy Commission,
August 16, 1957.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, August 7, 1957.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of August 2, 1957, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve the proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

The recommended agreement has been reviewed. The agreement will extend for a period of 10 years and no restricted data will be communicated under the proposed agreement.

The new agreement will broaden the scope of cooperation between Spain and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation on matters relating to the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors. The agreement also provides for the exchange of information in other unclassified areas

including health and safety problems related to the operation and use of such reactors.

Spain, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Spain.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell or lease, as may be agreed, to the Government of Spain uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent in the isotope U-235, except as noted below, in such quantities as may be agreed, for fueling defined reactor projects in Spain; provided, however, that the net amount of any uranium sold or leased during the period of the agreement does not exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235. It is expected that the U-235 to be transferred to Spain will be employed in a power demonstration and a research reactor and that the Commission at its discretion, may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. As in the case of sale transactions, in the event of lease, the agreement would permit the retention by the Government of Spain of special nuclear materials produced in fuel elements obtained from the United States.

The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of Spain for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling or, subject to Commission approval, are being reprocessed in Spain.

Article VI of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear material including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Article VIII provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed either in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission. In addition, article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to non-peaceful purposes.

In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to this end express their willingness to reappraise the agreement in the light of the establishment of the Agency, upon the request of either party.

The Commission has expressed its opinion that the proposed agreement will be an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Spain and the agreement contains all of the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(1) Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States;

(2) Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain enclosed with your letter of August 2, 1957; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Certified to be a true copy of originals.

A. L. GAMSON,

United States Atomic Energy Commission.

AUGUST 16, 1957.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain, on July 19, 1955, signed an Agreement for Cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas such agreement provides that it is the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial Agreement for Cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of Spain has advised the Government of the United States of America of its desire to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy including the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America desires to cooperate with the Government of Spain in such a program as hereinafter provided; and

Whereas the parties desire to supersede the Agreement for Cooperation signed on July 19, 1955, with this agreement which includes the new areas of cooperation;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For purposes of this agreement:

(a) "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

(b) "Spanish Junta" means the Junta de Energia Nuclear of the Government of Spain.

(c) "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" mean any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

(d) "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency, or government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

(e) "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

(f) "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear materials; or (3) the use of special nuclear materials in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

(g) "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

(h) "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the United States Atomic Energy Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

(i) "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by either party to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as either party may determine from time to time.

(j) "Parties" means the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain, including the United States Atomic Energy Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and the Spanish Junta on behalf of the Government of Spain. "Party" means one of the above parties.

ARTICLE II

A. The Agreement for Cooperation signed on July 19, 1955, is superseded in its entirety on the day this agreement enters into force.

B. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE III

A. Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such service involves the communication of restricted data.

B. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall assist each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

C. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately owned or has been received from another government.

ARTICLE IV

Subject to the provisions of article III, unclassified information, including information in the specific fields set out below, shall be exchanged between the parties with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses, and problems of health and safety connected therewith:

(a) The development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors;

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research, demonstration power, experimental power, and power reactors;

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

ARTICLE V

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) and any material, equipment, and devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement, shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, materials, equipment, and devices for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE VI

A. Research materials

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy as provided by article IV and under the limitations set forth in article III, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of either party, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

B. Research facilities

Subject to the provisions of article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States of America or Spain may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States of America or the Government of Spain will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to, and perform services for, the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

- (a) The limitations in article III;
- (b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain.

ARTICLE VIII

A. The Commission will sell or lease, as may be agreed, to the Government of Spain uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U-235, except as otherwise provided in paragraph C of this article, in such quantities as may be agreed in accordance with the terms, conditions, and delivery schedules set forth in contracts for fueling defined research, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors which the Government of Spain, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in Spain and as required in experiments related thereto: *Provided, however,* That the net amount of any uranium sold or leased hereunder during the period of this agreement shall not exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235. This net amount shall be the gross quantity of contained U-235 in uranium sold or leased to the Government of Spain during the period of this agreement less the quantity of contained U-235 in recoverable uranium which has been resold or otherwise returned to the Government of the United States of America during the period of this agreement or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the Government of the United States of America.

B. Within the limitations contained in paragraph A of this article, the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article

and in the custody of the Government of Spain shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of Spain or persons under its jurisdiction decide to construct and fuel with fuel obtained from the United States of America, as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of such reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling or, subject to the provisions of paragraph E, are being reprocessed in Spain, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

D. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of Spain may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in Spain, the Government of Spain will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

E. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

F. With respect to any special nuclear material not owned by the Government of the United States of America produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of Spain's need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organization in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

G. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of Spain and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph E hereof shall be returned to the Government of Spain, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby accorded, to retain with appropriate credit to the Government of Spain any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of the Government of Spain for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

H. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Spain may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Spain, the Government of Spain

shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of Spain or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Spain shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Spain or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, and under the limitations set forth in article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, other than special nuclear material, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE X

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Spain pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any—

- (i) reactor, and
- (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available to the Government of Spain or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, of which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission.

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Spain or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available—

- (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission,
- (ii) reactors,
- (iii) any other equipment or devices designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph B2 will apply,

- (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request

and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and

(b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Spain or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XI.

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Spain and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to article VIII of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VIII, paragraph F (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties.

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of Spain, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Spain, shall have access in Spain to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XI, and the failure of the Government of Spain to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B2 of this article.

6. To consult with the Government of Spain in the matter of health and safety.

C. The Government of Spain undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XI

The Government of Spain guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article X shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Spain or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise, will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Spain except as the United States Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation or an international organization, and then only if in the opinion of the United States Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States of America and the other nation or international organization.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Spain affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to this end:

(a) The parties will consult with each other, upon the request of either party, to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this Agreement for Cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the International Atomic Energy Agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards including those relating to health

and safety standards required by the Agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the Agency.

(b) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph (a) of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of Spain shall return to the United States Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being equally authentic, this 16th day of August 1957.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN WESLEY JONES,
(Acting Assistant Secretary of
State for European Affairs),
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
United States Atomic Energy Com-
mission.

For the Government of Spain:

JOSE M. AREILZA,
Ambassador of Spain.

Certified to be a true copy.

A. L. GAMSON,
United States Atomic Energy Com-
mission.

AUGUST 16, 1957.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Address entitled "A Time for Decision in Foreign Policy," delivered by Senator MANSFIELD to the convention on the Montana State Press Association, at Great Falls, Mont., on August 17, 1957.

RELIEF LEGISLATION FOR THE LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate and House are entering the final days of this first session of the 85th Congress and, as we all know, there will be a rush to put through many bills of both limited and extensive importance. Before Congress adjourns it is imperative that action be taken on relief legislation for the domestic lead and zinc industry. It would be disastrous to this mining industry if such legislation were lost in the last minute rush. We cannot wait until the next session of Congress.

The distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the other members of the Senate Committee on Finance, are to be commended for taking the initiative and amending H. R. 6894, a bill dealing with the tariff on mica, to include a provision which would impose a 3-cents-per-pound import duty on lead and zinc.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will act expeditiously on this bill so that it can go to conference. It is of the utmost importance to the economy of mining

areas in this country that relief legislation be enacted at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of telegrams and a letter be printed at this point in the RECORD. These communications come from many of those interested in the welfare of this industry, and commend the recent action taken by the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE, MONT., August 17, 1957.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Butte Chamber of Commerce endorses the action of the Senate Finance Committee in reference to establishing a flat 3-cent lead and zinc tax on imports of lead and zinc. Thousands of Montana miners have lost their jobs as a result of the unfair competition resulting from foreign imports of these metals. The administration bill as submitted to House Ways and Means Committee totally inadequate for lead and zinc industry. Will appreciate any help you can give the industry.

LARRY SMITH,
President.

PHILIPSBURG, MONT., August 18, 1957.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of Philipsburg Local No. 24, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, wish to commend you for your efforts on mineral bill and also 3 percent for higher tariff to elevate the serious condition of unemployment in Montana, which is growing day by day. Our sincere congratulations to all of your colleagues in this matter.

FRED SUPERNEAU,
Recording Secretary,
Philipsburg Local No. 24.

HELENA, MONT., August 17, 1957.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposal of Senate Finance Committee for a 3-cent tariff on lead and zinc should receive your full support. Policy of Government in letting in foreign lead and zinc practically duty free has driven the lead and zinc industries to the wall and unless something is done we will have no production of these metals and no new sources of supply will be opened up.

C. E. PEW.

HELENA, MONT., August 17, 1957.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Montana Chamber of Commerce endorses action Senate Finance Committee in connection with 3-cent lead-zinc tax bill. Administration bill as submitted House Ways and Means Committee inadequate. State-wide loss of mine employment estimated at 2,000 with no relief in sight. Strongly urge your consideration for inventive program.

BILL BROWNING,
Montana Chamber of Commerce.

ANACONDA, MONT., August 17, 1957.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Anaconda Mill and Smeltermen's Union want to commend you in your efforts on the lead-zinc tariff bill. It is our feeling there should be at the very least a 3-cent tariff to help alleviate the serious situation here and in other sections of Montana

where the unemployment has begun and is mounting day by day. Keep up the good work.

ANACONDA MILL AND SMELTERMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 117, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE MILL AND SMELTERWORKERS.

MISSOULA, MONT., August 17, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Our association endorses the action of Senate Finance Committee in connection with 3-cent lead and zinc tax bill which is very necessary to sustain industry in this area. Administration bill as submitted to House Ways and Means Committee will not suffice. Will appreciate any help you can give the industry.

WESTERN MONTANA MINING ASSOCIATION,
A. J. MOSBY, Secretary.

BUTTE, MONT., August 17, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse action of Senate Finance Committee in connection with 3-cent lead and zinc tax bill which is very necessary to sustain industry. Administration bill as submitted to House Ways and Means Committee completely inadequate for lead and zinc industry will appreciate any help you can give the industry.

W. G. MALONEY,
Mining Association of Montana.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., August 18, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Members here quite in your support in sponsorship of lead and zinc bill. Imperative that no less than 3-cent tax be imposed. Unemployment conditions here in lead and zinc mining has bleak outlook unless some remedy is passed. Business people and workers in these communities are deeply concerned. With the whole support of officers and members of Local 16, International Union of Mine Mill and Smelter Workers.

PERRY SEATON, President.

HELENA, MONT., August 17, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support on the tariff lead zinc bill. This tariff bill should not be less than 3 cents. This is needed to keep employment up in metals mining industry of the State of Montana. The unemployment has risen 40 percent in metals and mining industry in the State of Montana.

JOHN J. FONK,
President, East Helena Mine Mill Smelter Workers.

PHILIPSBURG, MONT., August 17, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Action taken by Senate Finance Committee on lead zinc tax yesterday greatly needed to save domestic industry. Any help by you will be greatly appreciated.

ROY McLEOD,
Manager, Trout Mining Division of American Machine & Metals, Inc.

BUTTE, MONT., August 18, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Montana lead zinc producers are forced to close down their operations due to unfair

competition resulting from the importation of immense quantities of these metals from low-wage foreign countries. Therefore the 3-cent lead zinc tax bill passed by the Senate Finance Committee will afford us at least partial relief. Please do all in your power to get this legislation passed at this session. The administration bill as submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee is totally inadequate for the lead and zinc industry.

JAMES A. ALLEN,
President, Lexington Silver Lead, Inc.,
Neihart, Mont.

BUTTE LODGE NO 88,
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS.

BUTTE, MONT., August 12, 1957.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The membership of Butte City Lodge No. 88, International Association of Machinists, urge you to advocate and vote for a tariff on copper, zinc, and lead which is being imported to the United States from foreign countries.

Yours truly,

ALAN S. LYLE,
Recording Secretary.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in line with the apprehensions some of us expressed last week with regard to the appropriations for our mutual security program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some editorials which appeared over the weekend, and which certainly are relevant to the pending discussions. I hope sincerely that the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is meeting today and tomorrow, will be able to offset some of the great harm that has been done throughout the world by the House action. Any letdown by the Free World now will threaten the security of all of us.

These editorials appeared in the Washington Star of Friday, August 16; the Washington Post of Saturday, August 17; the New York Herald Tribune of August 17; and the New York Times of Sunday, August 18.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 16, 1957]

DAMNED IF HE DOES

The President now has an opportunity to reflect on the unhappy plight of the man who was damned if he did—and damned if he didn't. For Mr. Eisenhower, sometimes denounced by his critics for failing to exercise strong leadership, is now under fire for attempting to dictate to Congress.

The fire has not been especially heavy or especially damaging. But there is no mistaking its intent and its target.

Mr. Eisenhower called his first special news conference Wednesday afternoon to announce that he would have to call Congress back into special session this fall if foreign aid funds should be cut appreciably below the \$3.3 billion authorized figure. He insisted that this should not be interpreted as a threat, so perhaps it can be called a serving of notice.

Whatever it may be called, it did not fall on receptive ears on Capitol Hill. Speaker RAYBURN said the President's warning was

unwise. Senator MANSFIELD said it was inadvisable. Minority Leader JOHNSON said he would not like to think that any man (in the Senate) would be influenced in his judgment by a suddenly called news conference. And so on.

But what is a President to do? Should he wait until after Congress has cut the appropriation, and then come forward with a futile criticism of the cut or a too-late appeal for restoration of the funds? It may be that the timing of the President's statement will hurt his case in a resentful Congress. Certainly the irresponsible slash which the House has made in the funds suggests as much. Nevertheless, we think Mr. Eisenhower did the right thing at the right time. His bid to save the appropriation should have been made before, not after, it had been dangerously reduced. If he had kept quiet, had he not spoken out in behalf of a program in which he deeply believes, then he would have been justly subject to criticism for letting the battle go by default.

We happen to believe that the President is correct in his belief that the security of the United States and of the Free World will be endangered if the foreign aid fund, the great bulk of which is for military aid, should be substantially reduced. Obviously, the House does not agree. Nor do a number of Senators, whose sincerity is not open to question. There should be no ruffled feelings among these gentlemen, however, merely because the President has served notice that he will call Congress back in special session if the funds are insufficient. Unquestionably, Congress has the right and the duty to make whatever appropriation it deems proper. But the President also has a right and a duty—to speak out in timely fashion against what Senator SMITH of New Jersey has called "economy gone mad."

[From the Washington Post of August 17, 1957]

UNFUNNY COMEDY

If the House vote to gut foreign aid funds was a comedy of errors, it was a comedy at the expense of the national interest. Perhaps in the confusion nothing could have been done to stop the disemboweling that seemed to have the fervor of a lynching bee. But it surely was a strange reversal of position for large numbers of House Democrats to be helibent on tearing apart a program which they had long supported stanchly, while the noted Republican economizer, Representative TABER, was commendably leading a fight to restore lopped funds. Paradoxically the drive to slash more than \$800 million out of the \$3.3 billion authorized by the House only hours earlier did not prevent members from voting \$5 million more for Guatemala on little more justification than the call for a gesture of friendship.

Why did it happen? For one thing, there apparently was resentment over what some Members considered a threat by President Eisenhower to call a special session of Congress this fall if the program were seriously cut. Perhaps Mr. Eisenhower's tactics were ill-advised in the circumstances. But Members cannot have matters both ways. They cannot consistently demand that the President speak out and use the prestige of his office in support of programs in the national interest, and then lambaste him when he does so. What Mr. Eisenhower said about the vital need for an adequate mutual security program was the simple truth.

For another thing, Members of Congress undoubtedly have been receiving heavy mail complaining about foreign aid. Some of this mail probably was inspired by the administration's earlier equivocal performance on the budget. In any event, lack of popular understanding of the importance of the program scarcely can save the consciences of Congressmen who do or should understand

it. Perhaps what is needed is more stress on the concept of mutual security rather than of foreign aid which is too easily portrayed as a giveaway. The United States gets value received for its money in terms of defense and economic stability abroad; and indeed much of the money actually is spent in this country.

Then there probably was pique among some Democrats over the administration's past tactics. It is true that in previous years the administration made a big show of economy by relying on unexpended balances and letting the pipeline become depleted. When it became necessary to replenish the pipeline there was a temptation to throw the predicament back in the administration's face. But as Democratic Representative EUGENE MCCARTHY noted, the real call was for the Democrats to remember what they had said in the past and vote consistently with it.

Not all the blame belongs on one side. Representative FLOON and some other Democrats fought hard alongside Republican leaders to restore perspective; and a number of Republicans voted against the President on the cuts. Some of the trouble arose from misunderstanding over amounts in the pipeline. Representative PASSMAN, who led the ax-wielders, did not approach the matter blindly, but he exhibited no imagination or sympathy for objectives. Perhaps friends of the program might have fought harder in the Appropriations Committee where the real work is done; it is unusual for the House to override a committee recommendation. In any event, the net result is a whipping slash of one-third off what the President originally requested.

Assuredly the world will not come to an end because the House has acted irresponsibly. The mutual security program will continue on the new funds and on previous appropriations. But the cuts will certainly make it more difficult to administer the program intelligently and may indeed invite waste and lack of confidence abroad. Whether or not a special session is called, a deficiency appropriation may well be necessary, and that will mean no real saving. Let us hope that the Senate will take heed at the House performance. Thursday was not a day of which the House can be proud.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 17, 1957]

FALSE ECONOMY

The House, in one of those aberrations that seem to seize legislative bodies when adjournment draws near, has slashed the mutual security program of the United States to ribbons. After authorizing a program totaling \$3,367,083,000 on Wednesday, on Thursday it refused to appropriate more than \$2,524,760,000 in new money and confined the whole program to \$3,191,800,000, including unspent funds.

The authorization measure, a compromise between House and Senate versions of the bill, was already half a billion dollars short of what President Eisenhower had requested. Signing it, the President took the unusual step of calling a special press conference to underline his fears that this cut would have "serious" effects and his "prayerful hope" that the act would enable his Government "to sustain the essential interests of the United States in the Free World." That the House could, the very next day, make a bad matter much worse shows a lack of responsibility on the part of that body.

There is no use, at this time, in assessing all the elements that went into the debacle. The administration undoubtedly contributed to it, in part through open dissensions among Cabinet members over the size of the budget, in part through the failure of the President, in person or by deputy, to fight for the mutual security program early enough, in part through the changes of front on military spending in the Defense Department budget.

But this does not relieve the House of the onus of slashing the mutual security funds in the teeth of warnings from almost everyone who knows what these funds mean to the United States and the Free World.

There are two ways in which the program can be salvaged. One is by firm Senate action, concurred in by the House. The other is by a special session. The President has said quite plainly that he will watch the overseas situation carefully and "whenever for lack of money the United States interests become placed in real jeopardy, at that moment I would have no recourse except to call a special session."

The House made its cuts in the name of economy. It is attempting to practice false economy, since for every dollar saved in this manner, much blood and treasure might have to be spent. As the President said: "Here is the cheapest money we can spend, as long as we are talking about getting security for the United States." The House majority—the Republicans put up a good fight for the President's plan—may prefer to get security the hard way, in isolation, but that is not what the American people have voted for in any election since World War II. The mutual security program must go forward, with all the money needed to do the job.

[From the New York Times of August 18, 1957]

GAMBLING WITH SECURITY

In the face of President Eisenhower's repeated warnings, the House of Representatives has now slashed the mutual security program, or so-called foreign aid, to the point of making it a mere pawn in a reckless gamble with our own national security and world peace. It did so when a strange majority of diverse elements in it succeeded in cutting the actual appropriation of new funds for the program to \$2,524,760,000 for the new fiscal year. This is \$1,340,000,000 below what President Eisenhower had requested as a rock-bottom figure and even \$809,650,000 below the compromise sum authorized by both House and Senate only a few days ago. A carryover of previously authorized funds brings the available total to \$3,191,810,000. But that does not reduce the cuts, and unless the House cuts are removed or reduced by the Senate, the whole program will be put in jeopardy.

The consequences of such a folly are not hard to visualize. The mutual security program is an integral part of both our foreign and defense policies designed to aid them in stemming Communist expansion and preserving the Free World as essential conditions for our own freedom and welfare. For this purpose we have undertaken to give economic aid to free nations, in particular the underdeveloped areas of the world, in order to enable them to grow strong economically and thereby erect psychological bulwarks against Communist penetration. For the same purpose we have extended military aid to such nations in order to enable them to build up their own defenses against Communist aggression, especially along the world's danger lines in Asia and in Europe.

In thus aiding other nations, as the responsible elements in them gratefully acknowledge, we have acted in keeping with our own highest ideals beyond anything the world has ever known, and no temporary frictions or resentments can obliterate this fact. But we have also been fortunate in that, in serving our ideals, we have also been able to serve our own best interests.

The economic foreign aid, contrary to general impression, has not been so much in dollars as in export of our goods, which helps both to expand our markets abroad and to support our own prosperity. And our military aid has helped to develop local defense forces which help defend not only their own

nations but also the United States at far less cost than we could possibly provide a like defensive strength at home. As President Eisenhower has pointed out, an investment of \$17 billion in military aid during the past 8 years has bought us \$107 billion worth of additional Free World defense by the efforts of other nations, which is a bargain indeed.

These local forces assume added importance in view of the new strategy which no longer relies on massive retaliation alone to avert or win a world war but seeks to cope with the possibility of little local wars. In such local wars, the local forces could be decisive, and any reduction in them would have to be compensated by increased American forces not only at far greater cost in money but perchance also in American blood. For lack of adequate local forces the Korean war cost us more than \$18 billion and 135,000 casualties, and the Congressmen voting for the mutual security cuts take the risk of making their savings at a similar cost in the future.

What is perhaps most reprehensible in the House action is that the cuts were made not on the basis of careful analysis of actual requirements but on the basis of log-rolling and meat-ax tactics. The rising neo-isolationism, especially in the South; the drive for economy, albeit a false economy in this instance; the budget muddle and just plain politics undoubtedly contributed to the result. But that all these factors could combine to produce this result is a warning both to our allies and to ourselves.

It is warning to our allies that the American public is beginning to weary of carrying so large a share of the Free World defense burden and now expects them to assume a bigger share of it. That goes especially for Germany and Japan. But it is also a warning to all free nations, including ourselves, that if we all weary of the burden or seek to shift it to shoulders unable to bear it we stand in danger of facilitating a Soviet victory in the cold war and unleashing a new Soviet aggressiveness which could burst into the flames of a hot war. That is why the mutual security cuts must be eliminated to avert a psychological snowballing effect that could lead to the disaster the program is designed to avert.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 10th anniversary of the emergence of India and Pakistan as independent nations, I am glad to join with other Senate colleagues in extending my very best wishes to these new, courageous countries. All of us are gratified beyond measure that the people of these two countries have now attained their freedom, independence, and self-determination, and that in spite of the difficulties which have beset them, they are maintaining their goal of freedom with determination and an inspiring faith.

The importance of India and Pakistan in the world picture cannot be overestimated. With Communist China behind the Iron Curtain, any wavering by these two great friends of the United States might well mean an all-Communist Asia. This would be a definite threat, not only to the security and peace of the world, but also to the survival of human freedom.

If these two countries are to succeed on the road to which their democratic institutions are now pointing, their own

efforts must be supported by the encouragement and assistance of all free countries.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the course of the United States must be clear in accepting responsibility for leadership at this critical period in the great worldwide struggle between slavery and freedom.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A 10th Anniversary," from the New York Times of August 15; and one entitled "Ten Years of Independence," from the Washington Post of the same date, be printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 15, 1957]

A 10TH ANNIVERSARY

India and Pakistan are celebrating today the 10th anniversary of their emergence as independent states. It is a day for congratulation and good wishes to both. It is also a day upon which to commend the wise and flexible policy on the part of Great Britain that made such a development possible.

These 10 years have been stormy. The first throes of partition brought about a horrible blood bath on the Indian subcontinent. Each of these new nations was born in terrible human tragedy. It will take a long time to erase, finally, the scars of that conflict.

But if the beginnings were inauspicious, the progress that has been made in both countries has been remarkable. The frequently predicted collapse, in one country or both, did not take place. Instead each has assumed a responsible and highly useful place in the family of nations. Each has had to come to grips with formidable economic problems and in each there has been a resolute will to effect their solution. Political progress, on the other hand, has been conspicuous. Really free governments have been set up. The right of opposition has been maintained and fostered. Democracy in the Free World has gained.

Considering the depth of the original cleavage, the degree of accommodation that has been reached is better than could have been expected. The situation today is vastly different from what it was 10 years ago. Responsible persons in both countries are determined to exert their utmost efforts to find peaceful and reasonable solutions for the vexing problems that are still outstanding.

These are large. The issue of the disposition of Kashmir is still the sorest point at contest between the two countries, and recent progress in that field has not been satisfactory, despite the good offices of the United Nations. The vital question of water rights and a division of water supply is still hanging fire, but some progress has been made. On smaller points, transfer of property, opening of frontiers and general friendly adjustments, the gains are great.

What we look forward to now, hopefully, therefore, is a second decade of independence for each of these countries in which many of these problems can be solved to the satisfaction of both. The Pakistanis, of their own free will, have become our allies in several important fields of defense. The Indians have chosen to take a somewhat more aloof course, but they have this Nation's continued and renewed friendship. We wish to put pressure to bear upon neither. We hope to be the staunch friend of both.

This is a day upon which well done can be said. It is also a day to hope that even more can be accomplished.

[From the Washington Post of August 15, 1957]

TEN YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

When we look back at our own history in the fitful decade after independence, it is easier to appreciate the uncertainties that have affected India and Pakistan in their first 10 years as free and sovereign nations. That India and Pakistan have survived and flourished, and that they have managed to improve their living standards even slightly, is a tribute to hardiness and perseverance of which they can be proud.

Partition solved, or partially solved, one problem—that of religious differences—at the expense of creating or continuing others. Refugees have been a major concern. Normal trade patterns have been altered and the artificial division has encouraged economic nationalism. The cankerous Kashmir dispute and the Indus River waters controversy—which lamentably divert attention and resources from more productive use—stem directly from partition. Nevertheless, partition is an irreversible fact.

Pakistan's policy since independence has been perhaps easier for Americans to understand than has India's. In part this derives from the fact that Pakistani leaders have sought to westernize and modernize their Moslem culture, in part from the fact that Pakistan has allied herself with the United States in military pacts. The effusive attention paid this alliance has tended to obscure some of Pakistan's political and economic deficiencies. The separation of east and west Pakistan by 1,200 miles of Indian territory has in itself created great economic and psychological handicaps. Pakistan's programs of agricultural and industrial improvement, though impressive, are far from sufficient, and the country subsists in considerable measure through American aid. And although the republic to its credit has adopted a constitution, it has yet to hold the promised general election or to develop real political stability.

India, by contrast, has shunned alliances, and Prime Minister Nehru has often been criticized for neutralism. This in turn has obscured some of India's substantial progress in creating a secular state, holding two free elections, abolishing the caste system, and launching a village improvement program. India's foreign policy is explicable in terms of her geographical and economic position. She is engaged in an enormous rivalry with Communist China to provide a better life for her people, and the success or failure of free methods in this rivalry with totalitarianism will have a vast impact on the future of Asia. In Mr. Nehru's view, India cannot afford to take sides against her northern neighbor.

This rivalry, and the fact that India's nearly 400 million people make her the world's second most populous nation, give crucial importance to her efforts to lift herself by her bootstraps. India's second 5-year plan, which already has produced useful industrial dividends, may have been overly ambitious in concept, particularly in the amount of reliance on foreign capital. Yet, especially because of India's pride and real efforts at self-help, extraordinary attention is warranted in this country to see that she gets the public and private assistance she needs. Because of the precarious margin of existence, shortcomings in either India or Pakistan can be extremely serious; the monumental struggle is to increase food and industry faster than the expansion of population.

In both countries there is a premium on intelligent leadership. Prime Minister Suhrawardy in Pakistan has political skill, but the political system does not yet have roots and the dangers of disintegration remain. Mr. Nehru has a great personal hold in India and the Congress Party contains many able men, but what will happen when this domi-

nant personality relinquishes his active role is not at all clear. India needs a vigorous loyal opposition that can by no means be furnished by the Communists who are ever ready to turn to quicker authoritarian means.

Apart from congratulations to both countries on this 10th anniversary of independence, what is required from the United States perhaps even more than continued help is a hard look at the long-range realities. This means consideration of more than what we merely want to see and hear. It means appreciation of the importance of the people of these two nations to the Free World, and a willingness to keep this importance foremost when misunderstandings arise. For their part, India and Pakistan could give extra meaning to their anniversary by rededicating themselves to solutions of their enervating differences over Kashmir and the Indus waters—solutions that recognize the necessity for face-saving on both sides.

RETIREMENT OF ADM. ARTHUR W. RADFORD

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Adm. Arthur William Radford, Chief of Staff of the Navy, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of the brilliant personalities in the history of our Navy, and one of the outstanding naval strategists of World War II, has just retired from active service. All of us are eager to applaud his great achievement for his country and for the world; and while his retirement comes as a well-deserved relaxation at this time in his career, he goes with the great regrets of many of us who have come to know him personally.

I have had the extreme privilege of knowing him well and on occasions, of working with him on matters affecting our national defense.

In 1949, accompanied by Mrs. Smith, I visited the Far East on a special mission of investigation for the Foreign Relations Committee. On our way to Japan, we stopped, going and coming, in Honolulu. Pearl Harbor was Admiral Radford's headquarters as Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet in the Pacific. We first came to know him there; but we also met him on subsequent trips, and especially a year or two later when he was in command of the Philippine and Formosa area, with his headquarters still in Honolulu. He became Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1953, after General Eisenhower became President.

On our first visit in 1949, I had the great privilege of gaining some of my first impressions of the then-existing problems of the Far East from conferences with Admiral Radford and members of his staff in Honolulu. Almost immediately at the beginning of our acquaintanceship, I realized his breadth of vision and his able grasp of the responsibilities growing out of our Far Eastern policies. He and General MacArthur, whose headquarters were in Tokyo, had close personal relationships with the naval problems of the Pacific area; and I realized Admiral Radford's understanding of the menace of Moscow in the China problem. He sized up the Russian infiltration into China as a conquest of that great country by subversive methods, and he was one of the first to

make it clear that there could be no compromise or coalition with the Red influences in China.

I have always felt the highest degree of confidence in his judgment as Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and have relied on his convictions as to our needs in our year-by-year mutual security programs.

Entirely aside from what might be called our professional relations, Mrs. Smith and I have enjoyed the personal friendship of Admiral and Mrs. Radford; and both of us express to them not only our deep appreciation of their wonderful service to our country and to the world, but also our appreciation of the personal interest they have always shown in their friends. We value deeply their friendship, and we wish for them the maximum of happiness and worthwhile accomplishments in the days that lie ahead.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 21 major generals for permanent appointment in the Regular Army, 2 major generals and 2 brigadier generals for temporary appointment in the Army, and 1 major general and 1 brigadier general for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers in the Army. I also report favorably the name of Rear Admiral Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral and the names of 25 captains for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Maj. Gen. Ira Kenneth Evans, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Roosevelt Moses, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Robert Ernest Frankland, National Guard of the United States, and Col. Clarence Birnie Johnson, Jr., National Guard of the United States, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral; and

James M. Farrin, Jr., and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the Navy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In addition to the above, I report favorably a group of 787 appointments and promotions in the Regular Air Force, all in the grade of captain and below. In order to save the expense of printing on the executive calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Richard T. Durkee, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

John P. Darby, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Neil Hosler McElroy, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James H. Smith, Jr., of Colorado, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John J. Gilhooley, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge, municipal court for the District of Columbia, for a term of 10 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished acting majority leader that I understand that on tomorrow, Tuesday, according to the plan, the calendar of measures to which there is no objection will be called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In that connection, of course the two calendar committees are to be notified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF LEAD AND ZINC LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after a conference with the distinguished minority leader, and with his full concurrence, I wish to announce to the Senate that after the call of the calendar is concluded tomorrow, the proposed legislation dealing with the imposition of an excise tax on lead and zinc, reported by the Committee on Finance, will be taken up for consideration. I think Senators ought to know that. The bill is important to different sections of the country. In this way, notice is being served that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar tomorrow, the lead and zinc bill will be brought to the attention of the Senate for consideration.

THE RAID ON DIEPPE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men who took part in the raid on Dieppe 15 years ago today.

Of the 6,000 men who landed at Dieppe, France, at 5 o'clock that morning, only 2,000 were taken off the beaches 8 hours later.

The force which landed was comprised mainly of Canadians, and the Canadians sustained a loss of 3,373 men.

In 1942, the Allied Forces were being pressed to open a second front in Europe. It was decided after long and careful planning to carry out a raid on the French seaport of Dieppe in order that the Allies might test the permanent defense emplacements manned by well-trained German troops with strong firepower.

Without Dieppe, no accurate appraisal could have been made of the factors which would be involved in a full-scale invasion. The information gained from the Dieppe raid was of great value to Allied victory on the Normandy beach-heads.

Costly though this operation was, as Lieutenant General Crerar—GOC 1st Canadian Corps—stated:

The casualties sustained in the raid were part of the price paid for knowledge that enabled the great operation of 1944 to be carried out at a cost in blood smaller than even the most optimistic had ventured to hope for.

To all those who dared the venture, and especially to our neighbors, the Canadians who displayed at Dieppe their traditional valor, I pay a thankful tribute, joined, I am sure, by the people of this Nation.

INCREASING COMPETITION IN UNDERWRITING OF PUBLIC REVENUE BONDS

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 8, I arranged for the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a printed debate, as published in the magazine of the National Association of County Officials, on the issue of a significant bill offered by the junior Senator of Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. This bill would permit commercial banks to participate in underwriting of public revenue bonds.

I stated at that time that I was looking forward to receiving the reactions of interested folks in my own and other States on this issue.

A good many reactions have now come in.

Illustrating such reactions on the part of municipal officials was a letter which I received from Virgil H. Hurless, comptroller of the city of Milwaukee.

He pointed out that recently that great city sold \$10 million in water-works-mortgage revenue bonds, of the type which would be affected by the Clark bill. And he added:

It has always been my opinion that additional competition for the purchase of this type of bond could conceivably result in lower interest rates to the municipality issuing them.

Therefore, the office of the comptroller favors the enactment of this legislation; and so does the American Municipal Association and the League of Wisconsin Municipalities.

We are all aware, I believe, that cities across the Nation are exceedingly hard pressed financially to catch up with the enormous demands of their expanding populations for additional services.

Under these circumstances, I believe that the views expressed by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, as adopted in a resolution in June of this year, will be of interest. I now send the resolution to the desk.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution favoring participation by commercial banks in the underwriting and sale of revenue bonds

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it a proposal to permit commercial banks to deal and trade in municipal revenue bonds; and

Whereas the Banking Act of 1933 presently forbids the dealing in such bond issues by commercial banks; and

Whereas this type of legislation, if passed, would serve to broaden competition for revenue-bond financing and would probably have the further result of decreasing interest rates on such bonds; and

Whereas the city of Milwaukee is contemplating the issuance of \$10 million in water-works mortgage revenue bonds during 1957, an equal amount in 1958, and subsequent

issuances for such purposes over the next 15 years which may amount to more than \$36 million additional; and

Whereas the American Municipal Association has repeatedly requested the Congress to amend section 51.36 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to authorize commercial banks to participate in such financing in competition with other financial institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it inform the Congressmen and Senator from Wisconsin that it favors the passage of such legislation to permit commercial banks to deal and trade in public revenue bonds.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Milwaukee on June 25, 1957.

STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

LETTER WRITTEN ON JANUARY 19, 1956, TO CLATSOP COUNTY, OREG., COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN-BORN

MR. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 16, 1957, the House Committee on Un-American Activities released a report which reproduced, at page 45, a letter written by me on January 19, 1956, to Mrs. Kathleen Ruuttila, secretary of the Clatsop County Committee for Protection of the Foreign-Born. Clatsop County is located in northwestern Oregon.

The letter which I addressed to Mrs. Ruuttila was in answer to a communication that she had sent to me under date of January 4, 1956, regarding revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and reduction of the age at which women become eligible for social security.

Mr. President, let me state this emphatically for the RECORD. My office receives approximately 150 letters a day when Congress is in session. We try our best to answer each letter from the State of Oregon, in full recognition of the constitutional right of the people to petition their elected representatives. Writers of some letters which I receive are members of organizations that hold views which are diametrically opposed to my own. Yet I believe that they are entitled to an answer. Nor do I feel that, by replying, I am endorsing the positions taken by the organization—or individual—involved. I write to persons in Oregon who favor the administration's partnership power policy. Although this fact is common knowledge, critics of my stand on comprehensive river development do not take this as an indication that I have suddenly accepted the administration's waterpower program. In addition, I have engaged in extended correspondence on matters of importance to Oregon with people who stumped the State making extremely critical speeches against me during the 1954 election campaign. I do not apply any test of agreement or conformity when I answer mail.

However, Mr. President, I willingly accept responsibility for the substantive contents of what I have written in the letter of January 19, 1956, which was reproduced in the report of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Let us analyze that letter briefly. In the letter I told why I was cosponsoring and supporting Senate bill 1206 of the 84th Congress. This was a bill to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. There were 12 other Senator sponsors besides myself. These included Senators Lehman, Green, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kennedy, Langer, Magnuson, McNamara, Morse, Murray, Pastore, and Chavez. Of course, any person would be proud to be enumerated in that list of Members of the Senate, and I share such pride.

Mr. President, I hope it has not become un-American to suggest that the McCarran-Walter Act requires revision in the name of justice, fairness, humanity and the longstanding heritage of our country. In the event that any such notion prevails, I should like to cite the fact that the President of the United States—as well as a great many Members of both the Senate and House—believe our immigration code needs a complete and thorough overhaul. In addition, I have long been active in urging that our gates be opened to unfortunate refugee orphans in quest of sanctuary.

In the second portion of my letter of January 19, 1956, I told why I believe the social-security retirement age for women annuitants should be lowered from 65 to 62 and perhaps down to the age of 60.

Mr. President, I am proud of my leadership in the Senate in this vital realm of human welfare. If I am not mistaken, I introduced the first Senate measure which sought as its goal to enable women to retire at a younger age than 65. On January 18, 1955, I introduced S. 521 of the 84th Congress, which reduced the social-security qualifying age for women from 65 to 60. Many other Senators of both the Democratic and Republican Parties later introduced similar bills, patterned after mine.

I am happy to report that the 84th Congress took some beneficial action in this respect, although not all that we might have liked. It lowered the social-security retirement age for women to 62, although on a sliding scale of benefits rather than with full benefits. In this Congress I have introduced S. 498 for Senator Morse and myself, to achieve a retirement age at 60 with full benefits for female annuitants.

I have thus gone into some detail, Mr. President, so that I may analyze fully the political views which I expressed in the letter of January 19, 1956, which was reproduced by the House Un-American Activities Committee. I stand behind what I said in that letter about the need for revising the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and about lowering the social-security age for women.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with these brief remarks in the RECORD a message dated January 31, 1957, in which the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, urged upon us extensive and thorough revisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. This should serve to demonstrate that it is not unpatriotic to take the position which I have held on this issue.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD my article in the November 1955 issue of Eagle magazine entitled "Begin Women's Benefits at the

Age of 60," which amplifies my views and attitude on this important topic covered in my letter, plus the text of Mrs. Ruuttila's letter of January 4, 1956, from Astoria, Oreg., and my answer, dated January 19, 1956.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., January 4, 1955.

HON. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I appreciated your sending me some time ago a copy of the bill to revise the Nationality Act of 1952 (Walter-McCarran law), and would like very much to have another copy at this time. The first copy is now in use by one of the Astoria unions.

I would also appreciate any information your office can send me as to the present status of this bill and how it may have been affected by the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee which began on November 21. A great many people here are grateful to you for your support of this measure, and it is our sincere hope that the unjust Walter-McCarran law will be erased from the statute books in 1956.

I was very much interested in the report, in a special story by Washington Correspondent A. Robert Smith in today's Oregonian that you plan to seek a reduction in the age requirement for women applying for social security. This would be of considerable importance locally, where so many women of past middle age are forced to work in the fish canneries in order to live. Since the main industries here are deep-sea fishing and logging, it could be demonstrated, I believe, that these being such hazardous occupations there are more widows per capita in Clatsop County than in any other section of the State. These women have to work, and do so even when their doctors have advised them not to. In the past year several women died of heart attacks in the canneries or shortly after returning home from work. I regret that there is not more publicity in the local paper, the Astorian Budget about your position on social-security liberalization.

Sincerely,
KATHLEEN RUUTILA,
Secretary, Clatsop County Committee
for Protection of Foreign Born (Unaffiliated).

JANUARY 19, 1956.

Mrs. KATHLEEN RUUTILA,
Secretary, Clatsop County Committee
for Protection of Foreign Born,
Astoria, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. RUUTILA: I am glad that you support S. 1206, the bill to revise the Walter-McCarran Act, of which I am co-sponsor. Under separate cover, I am sending you the additional copy as you requested, along with the copy of the Walter-McCarran Act.

The Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee expects to hold additional hearings on this bill later this month. I shall be pleased to send you a copy of the transcript of these hearings as soon as they become available, which will be sometime after March 1. It is impossible to predict at this time the recommendations that this committee may report to the Senate, but you may be assured that I shall support such legislation which is designed to liberalize this unfair and inequitable law.

I enclose a copy of my bill (S. 521) which proposes to lower the eligibility age for women under social security from 65 to 60. This bill is now before the Senate Committee on Finance, along with the legislation passed by the House of Representatives during the

last session of Congress which would lower the retirement age for women from 65 to 62. I plan to testify before this committee concerning my bill, and, at that time, I shall be pleased to inform the committee of your views on this matter. If the bill recommended by the committee lowers the age for women to only 62, it will be a step forward and you may be assured that I shall continue my efforts to have the eligibility age for women under social security lowered to 60.

You may enjoy reading the enclosed copy of my article which appeared in the Eagles magazine about social security for women.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO IMMIGRATION MATTERS (DOC. NO. 85, 85TH CONG., 1ST SESS.)

To the Congress of the United States:

The eyes of the Free World have been fixed on Hungary over the past 2½ months. Thousands of men, women, and children have fled their homes to escape Communist oppression. They seek asylum in countries that are free. Their opposition to Communist tyranny is evidence of a growing resistance throughout the world. Our position of world leadership demands that, in partnership with the other nations of the Free World, we be in a position to grant that asylum.

Moreover, in the 4½ years that have elapsed since the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the practical application of that law has demonstrated certain provisions which operate inequitably and others which are outmoded in the world of today.

Prompt action by the Congress is needed looking toward the revision and improvement of that law.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Last October the people of Hungary, spontaneously and against tremendous odds, rose in revolt against Communist domination. When it became apparent that they would be faced with ruthless deportation or extinction, a mass exodus into Austria began. Fleeing for their lives, tens of thousands crossed the border into Austria seeking asylum. Austria, despite its own substantial economic problems, unselfishly and without hesitation received these destitute refugees. More than 20 nations have expressed their willingness to accept large numbers of them.

On November 8, I directed that extraordinary measures be taken to expedite the processing of 5,000 Hungarian visa applications under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. On November 19, the first of this group departed from Vienna for the United States. By November 29, it had become clear that the flight of Hungarian men, women, and children to gain freedom was assuming major proportions.

On December 1, I directed that above and beyond the available visas under the Refugee Relief Act—approximately 6,500 in all—emergency admission should be granted to 15,000 additional Hungarians through the exercise by the Attorney General of his discretionary authority under section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and that, when these numbers had been exhausted, the situation be reexamined.

On December 12, I requested the Vice President to go to Austria so that he might inspect, firsthand, the tragic situation which faced the refugees. I also appointed a President's Committee for Hungarian Refugee Relief to assure full coordination of the work of the voluntary agencies with each other and with the various Government agencies involved.

On January 1, 1957, following his return to the United States, the Vice President made a personal inspection of our reception center at Camp Kilmer and then reported to me his findings and recommendations. He reported that the people who had fled from Hungary were largely those who had been in the forefront of the fight for freedom. He concluded that "the countries which accept these refugees will find that, rather than having assumed a liability, they have acquired a valuable national asset."

Most of the refugees who have come to the United States have been admitted only temporarily on an emergency basis. Some may ultimately decide that they should settle abroad. But many will wish to remain in the United States permanently. Their admission to the United States as parolees, however, does not permit permanent residence or the acquisition of citizenship. I believe they should be given that opportunity under a law which deals both with the current escapee problem and with any other like emergency which may hereafter face the Free World.

First, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation giving the President power to authorize the Attorney General to parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe escapees, selected by the Secretary of State, who have fled or in the future flee from Communist persecution and tyranny. The number to whom such parole may be granted should not exceed in any 1 year the average number of aliens who, over the past 8 years, have been permitted to enter the United States by special acts of Congress outside the basic immigration system.

Second, I urge the Congress promptly to enact legislation giving the necessary discretionary power to the Attorney General to permit aliens paroled into the United States, who intend to stay here, to remain as permanent residents. Consistent with existing procedures, provision should be made for submission of the cases to Congress so that no alien will become a permanent resident if it appears to the Congress that permanent residence in his case is inappropriate. Legislation of this type would effectively solve the problem of the Hungarian escapees who have already arrived and, furthermore, would provide a means for coping with the cases of certain Korean orphans, adopted children, and other aliens who have been granted emergency admission to this country and now remain here in an indefinite status. This should be permanent legislation so that administrative authorities are in a position to act promptly and with assurance in facing emergencies which may arise in the future.

QUOTA SYSTEM

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, essentially a codification of the existing law, retained the national origins quota system established in 1924. In the more than a quarter of a century since that time experience has demonstrated a need to re-examine the method laid down in the law for the admission of aliens. I know that Congress will continue to make its own study of the problems presented, taking into consideration the needs and responsibilities of the United States. There are, however, certain interim measures which should be immediately taken to remove obvious defects in the present quota system.

First, the quota should be based on the 1950 census of population in place of the 1920 census. An annual maximum of 154,857 quota immigrants is now provided, using the 1920 census. I believe that the economic growth over the past 30 years and present economic conditions justify an increase of approximately 65,000 in quota numbers.

Second, an equitable distribution of the additional quota numbers should be made.

Under the present system a number of countries have large unused quota numbers while other countries have quotas regularly over-subscribed. I recommend that the additional quota numbers be distributed among the various countries in proportion to the actual immigration into the United States since the establishment of the quota system in 1924 and up to July 1, 1955.

Third, quota numbers unused in 1 year should be available for use in the following year. Under existing law if a quota number is not used during the year it becomes void. In my view Congress should pool the unused quota numbers for Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific oceanic area. Those numbers should be distributed during a 12-month period on a first-come, first-serve basis without regard to country of birth within the area. However, I recommend that these unused quota numbers be available only to aliens who qualify for preference status under existing law—persons having needed skills or close relatives in the United States.

Fourth, the so-called mortgage on quotas resulting from the issuance of visas under the Displaced Persons Act and other special acts should be eliminated. Visas issued under these acts were required to be charged against the regular immigration quota with the result that quotas in some instances are mortgaged far into the future. I recommend that the mortgages so created be eliminated, consistent with the action of Congress when it enacted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which provided for special nonquota visas.

Fifth, the Congress should make provisions in our basic immigration laws for the annual admission of orphans adopted or to be adopted by American citizens. Experience has demonstrated that orphans admitted under earlier special legislation have successfully adjusted to American family life. It also has revealed that there are many Americans eager to adopt children from abroad.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF FOR HARDSHIP CASES

The large and ever-increasing mass of immigration bills for the relief of aliens continues to place an unnecessary burden upon the Congress and the President. Private immigration laws in recent years have accounted for more than one-third of all enactments, both public and private. Like any other enactment, each case must be separately examined and studied as to its merits by the Congress and the President. The problem presented is usually a determination whether hardships and other factors in the particular case justify an exception from the ordinary provisions of the immigration laws. These determinations could be effected without resort to legislation if the necessary administrative authority is provided. I recommend that the Attorney General be granted authority, subject to such safeguards as Congress may prescribe, to grant relief from exclusion and expulsion to aliens having close relatives in this country, to veterans, and to functionaries of religious organizations. Generally these are the classes of cases which have been favorably regarded by Congress because of the hardship involved.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

In addition to the quota revisions, experience under existing immigration law has made it clear that a number of changes should be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Some provisions create unnecessary restrictions and limitations upon travel to the United States while others inflict hardships upon aliens affected. I have made a number of proposals for amendments; with some minor modifications, I renew those recommendations and call attention here to certain of them.

One of the obstacles to travel, and a hindrance to the free exchange of ideas and commerce, is the requirement in the present law that every alien who applies for a visa or whom comes to the United States without a visa but remains for as much as 30 days be fingerprinted. In some foreign countries fingerprinting is regarded with disfavor. Lacking any significant contribution to our national safety and security, the law should be amended to eliminate the requirement of fingerprinting for aliens coming to the United States for temporary periods.

I further recommend an amendment to the law to permit aliens traveling from one foreign country to another, passing merely in transit through the United States, to go through this country without undergoing inspection and examination, and without complying with all the standards for admission. This would eliminate hardships to the traveler, loss of good will, and much expense to the transportation companies.

The laws should be amended to eliminate the necessity for immigration officers to inspect and apply all grounds of exclusion to aliens seeking admission to the mainland of the United States from Alaska and Hawaii. These Territories are part of the United States and aliens who have entered or are present in them are subject to all the provisions of the law. If any were deportable before arriving on the mainland their deportable status continues.

I recommend the repeal of that provision in the law which requires aliens to specify their race and ethnic classification in visa applications.

A large number of refugees, possibly thousands, misrepresented their identities when obtaining visas some years ago in order to avoid forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain. Such falsification is a mandatory ground for deportation and in respect to these unfortunate people some relief should be granted by the Congress.

Inequitable provisions relating to the status under the immigration laws of Asian spouses, and of adopted and other children, should be rectified.

Alien members and veterans of our Armed Forces who have completed at least 3 years of service are unable to apply for naturalization without proof of admission for permanent residence. I recommend that this requirement be eliminated in such cases, and that the naturalization law applicable to such persons be completely overhauled.

While the present law permits adjustment of status to permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens, it is unnecessarily restrictive as to aliens married to United States citizens. Adjustment is forbidden if the alien has been in the United States less than 1 year prior to his marriage. This results in the disruption of the family and causes unnecessary expense to the alien who is forced to go abroad to obtain a nonquota visa. It is my recommendation that the requirement of 1 year's presence in the United States before marriage be repealed.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

I have previously called the attention of the Congress to the necessity for a strengthening of our laws in respect to the aliens who resort to repeated judicial reviews and appeals for the sole purpose of delaying their justified expulsion from this country. Whatever the ground for deportation, any alien has the right to challenge the Government's findings of deportability through judicial process. This is as it should be. But the growing frequency of such cases brought for purposes of delay, particularly those involving aliens found to be criminals and traffickers in narcotics and subversion, makes imperative the need for legislation limiting and carefully defining the judicial process.

I have asked the Attorney General to submit to the Congress legislative proposals

which will carry into effect these recommendations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1957.

[From the Eagle of November 1955]

BEGIN WOMEN'S BENEFITS AT THE AGE OF 60

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

If a married couple is to retire adequately under our social-security system, both husband and wife should be drawing benefits to assure an American standard of living. Furthermore, many single women find it increasingly difficult to continue in good jobs past the age of 60.

These facts lurk in the background of an impending fundamental change in our social-security structure, which may occur during the next 12 months. It would be a change affecting millions of people—and undoubtedly for the better. Its basic purpose is simple and direct—to reduce the social security qualifying age for women from 65, where it is at present, to 60.

Already a bill has passed the House of Representatives lowering the age for women to 62. It probably will be enacted into law when the United States Senate convenes again in January of 1956. This is only the first setup. Many lawmakers believe the age of 62 still would be too high. Such influential Members of Congress as LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Senate majority leader, and JERE COOPER of Tennessee, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, are on record in favor of retirement at 60 for women.

In my opinion, the reasons for this reform are so compelling that the first major bill which I introduced as a Member of the Senate was one to change the social-security age for women from 65 to 60. A number of other Senators soon introduced identical measures, with the assurance that they shared my views on the subject.

What are those views?

Under existing social-security rules, no wife of a retired worker can qualify for benefits until she reaches 65. Yet, in most family situations, the husband's retirement benefits cannot properly keep the couple in food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. In the great majority of these families, the wife is from 4 to 7 years younger than her husband. This is revealed by the fact that, although less than one-fifth of the married men who attain 65 have a wife of the same age or older, more than half of these men have a wife who has reached the age of 60.

I am informed that many male workers do not retire until several years after their 65th birthday. This means that a reduction to 60 of the age requirement for wife's benefits will permit the wives of approximately 75 percent of the married men who claim retirement status to receive wife's benefits, too, when their husbands retire.

Some of this may appear to be technical, but what does it all add up to? One social-security check is generally not enough for husband and wife. If the woman could qualify at the same time as her spouse, this economic hardship might be eliminated. Because most wives are younger than their mates, this can only be accomplished by allowing the wife to qualify for benefits at a lower age than her husband.

Of course, single women have a direct stake in this change also. Many women aged 60 or over find it virtually impossible to get a job unless they have been recently employed. Single women, aged widows, and aged dependent mothers of deceased workers therefore should likewise be able to qualify for benefits at 60. If the age requirement for women were lowered to 60, about two-fifths of the workers' widows without minor

children in their care would be eligible for these benefits immediately.

Because the Eagles were the first great national group to undertake a crusade for social security and old-age assistance, this reform should interest most Eagles throughout the Nation. It is a change which would help to ease life's strains and perils in elderly years not only for many women, but also for their families and husbands.

Since I introduced my bill (S. 521) to lower the social-security age for women from 65 to 60, enough letters and other information have cascaded across my desk to convince me that innumerable members of the distaff sex in the United States do not fare well economically when they are past the age of three score years.

For example, the noted economic analyst, Sylvia F. Porter, wrote recently: "If you're a man over 45 or a woman over 35 looking for a job even in this cycle of rising employment, you're facing an uphill struggle. No matter what your skills or experience, the odds are you'll go through some agonizing interviews before you get settled."

The help-wanted ads in the newspapers make abundantly clear what Miss Porter is writing about. When clerks or stenographers or typists are wanted, the stipulation often closes with "must not be over 35." It is not only the artists' models and stage dancers who must be young. Many business and industrial firms seem reluctant to hire women who are even remotely approaching middle age.

Gertrude Houk Fariss, the national chairman of the status of women committee of the American Association of University Women, has announced that the problem is one of growing gravity. Mrs. Fariss, herself a school principal, believes the discrimination against older women has intruded into the realm of education.

"Although there is no rule against accepting women who are older than the ages of 40 or 45," explains Mrs. Fariss, "we find, for example, that women past those years are not encouraged to earn higher degrees. I know of one, now a very successful physician, who had real trouble when—at 45—she decided to enter the field of medicine. She had great difficulty gaining admittance both to a medical school and to internship."

Actuarial statistics of insurance companies disclose that the average American women can expect to live to an older age than her husband. Female longevity is now greater. This means that the Nation is populated by a considerable number of widows. Suppose a working man has died at 65. His widow, who likely will be some years younger than her husband, has to wait 5 or 10 years before she can draw one penny of all the money which her husband had contributed through the years to the social-security system.

This patently is not fair. What is the widow to do until she attains the qualifying age? She herself may not have worked for many years. What sort of position can she obtain? How many women in later years are physically or psychologically capable of performing the drudgery of chambermaid work or toiling in a laundry? A man's widow may be forced to prove her poverty and to ask for public assistance, in order to carry her through a waiting period of 5 or 10 years. Meanwhile her late husband's substantial contributions lie idle in the social security fund.

The average social-security benefits per person may possibly reach \$60 a month in 1956, or about \$720 a year. Yet the Government estimates of the entirely modest living costs for an elderly couple made in 1950, when prices were lower than they are now, ranged from \$1,602 in New Orleans to \$1,908 in Milwaukee. The average was about \$1,750.

How can we ask any elderly couple to subsist on the husband's social security retirement alone? It simply cannot be done. Even with the benefits of the husband and

wife combined, the total will be in the neighborhood of only \$1,440—a fine start toward security in old age but definitely not sufficient for a comfortable way of life.

Informal estimates which I have sought from the Social Security System indicate that the cost of benefits for the retirement of wives, widows, and working women at 60 instead of 65 would amount to 1 percent of the total national payroll. This would require one-half of 1 percent more from workers, and one-half of 1 percent more from employers. I understand that both of our large trade-union groups, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, have announced the willingness of their members to shoulder this extra burden.

More than 5 years ago the Advisory Council on Social Security endorsed a reduction to 60 of the retirement age for women. Dr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, first director of the social security system, holds a similar belief. Indeed, no other single basic change in social security commands such widespread support.

The year 1955 has marked the 20th anniversary of the signing into law of the Social Security Act itself. On August 14, 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt put his pen to one of the most beneficial and far-reaching statutes ever enacted in America, announcing as he did so, "It represents a cornerstone in a structure that is being built but is by no means complete—a structure intended to lessen the force of possible future depressions."

F. D. R. knew well the lessons of history. That is why he implied social security would undergo many fundamental changes. He recalled that even our Federal Constitution had to be revised, soon after its adoption, by the addition of the first 10 amendments which we know as the Bill of Rights. President Roosevelt was aware that social security, for all its bright hopes, would require revision to keep it apace of changing needs in an everchanging world.

As the poet Lowell once wrote:

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth."

Logic and science dictate that the social security qualifying age for members of the female sex should be lowered to 60. I believe this change would be a fitting way in which to commemorate the second full decade of the existence in the United States of our social security program.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Eagle Senator NEUBERGER's bill for lowering from 65 to 60 the age at which women may qualify for old age and survivors insurance benefits was introduced into the Senate on January 18. Those who cosponsored the bill, many of whom are Eagles, were Senators MORSE, HILL, HUMPHREY, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, McNAMARA, SPARKMAN, KEFAUVER, JACKSON, and MURRAY. Two others later introduced identical bills—POTTER and WILEY.)

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR DISASTER AREAS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will approve, and the conferees will sustain, the committee amendment to H. R. 9131 providing \$25 million to meet the emergency conservation needs of rural areas recently struck by floods and other natural disasters.

Kentucky is one of the States which has suffered serious farm damage this year from excessive rainfall and floods. Unless the destruction of established conservation measures on thousands of farms is promptly repaired, this damage will be multiplied and compounded. For this reason, I was glad to join with my

colleagues from the southwestern States similarly affected, several of them even more seriously than Kentucky, in presenting to the Appropriations Committee the nature and extent of this damage and the urgent need for rehabilitation measures to return the damaged land to productive agricultural use.

In late January, eastern Kentucky was struck with the most devastating flood in the history of that area. More recently, western Kentucky has been subjected to widespread and extensive, if less dramatic, farm damage. I have already described to the committee the nature of the problems which many Kentucky farmers face today as a result of these natural disasters.

I do not believe these emergency conservation needs can be met out of regular funds without seriously impairing the regular ACP, or without destroying the continuity of the work in other counties, and the established practices on individual farms fortunately unaffected by this emergency. Furthermore, this emergency assistance is needed at once; farmers ought not be asked to wait until next June to receive their share of payments for emergency work done this fall and next spring at a time when their losses are heavy and their income sharply reduced.

At the request of the committee, I understand the Department of Agriculture last week obtained the best available figures from each State as to the amount of emergency conservation funds needed for this work. The figures submitted by the Kentucky State Disaster Committee include \$871,000 for western Kentucky and \$691,000 for eastern Kentucky—a total of \$1,562,000 for the State. The total for all States was approximately \$25 million.

If Congress approves this amount, as recommended by the Committee, it is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture will be able to meet these requests for emergency assistance by the several States which have suffered these natural disasters. I trust that the Congress will do so, and that the Department will promptly initiate this emergency program at a level and in accord with these requests submitted by the affected States.

PRODUCTION OF STATEMENTS AND REPORTS BY WITNESSES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that someday this week the leadership intends to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2377, a bill to amend the United States Code to provide for production of statements and reports by witnesses.

This bill was prepared by the Department of Justice, which stated that its purpose was to clarify the ruling of the Supreme Court in the notorious Jencks case, and for no other purpose.

A number of other Senators, including myself, have been concerned with the fact that the bill as drawn, redrawn, and again redrawn by the Department of Justice would do a good deal more than merely clarify some of the ambiguities in the Jencks case.

I have had printed an amendment to S. 2377, in the nature of a substitute. In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to consider the substitute before making up their minds on how to vote on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding a new section 3500 which shall read as follows:

"§ 3500. Demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses

"(a) In any criminal prosecution brought by the United States, no statement or report of a prospective witness which is in the possession of the United States shall be the subject of subpoena, discovery, or inspection, except as provided in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or as provided in paragraph (b) of this section.

"(b) Before a witness called by the United States has testified on direct examination, the court shall, on motion of the defendant, order the United States to produce for delivery directly to the defendant, for use in cross-examination, any relevant portions of such reports or statements of the witness in the possession of the United States as include a recitation or the substance of any oral or written statement previously made by the witness which relate directly to the substance of the testimony of that witness. In the event that the United States claims that the reports or statements ordered to be delivered to the defendant contain matter which does not relate to the subject matter of the testimony, the court shall order the United States to produce such reports or statements for the inspection of the court in camera. Upon such production the court shall excise the portions, if any, of said reports or statements which contain information not relating to the subject matter as to which the witness has testified. With such information excised, the court shall then direct delivery of such reports and statements to the defendant for use in cross-examination. If, pursuant to such procedure, any portion of such reports or statements is withheld from the defendant, and the trial is continued to an adjudication of the guilt of the defendant, the entire reports or statements shall be preserved by the United States and, in the event the defendant shall appeal, shall be made available to the appellate court at its request for the purpose of determining the correctness of the ruling of the trial judge.

"(c) In the event that the United States elects not to comply with an order of the court under paragraph (b) hereof to deliver to the defendant any report or statement or such portion thereof as the court may direct, the court shall take such action, including but not limited to striking from the record the testimony of the witness, declaring a mistrial, or ordering the dismissal of the indictment, as the interests of justice require.

"(d) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'3500. Demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses'."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment does four things which the bill does not do. First, it makes it abundantly clear that we are not attempting

to amend or appeal or change in any way the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I am fearful that the Justice Department bill would do that by implication. We should not do that without very grave and careful thought. In my judgment, those rules need no amendment in order to clarify the meaning of the Jencks opinion.

In the second place, my substitute would require the production of statements of prospective witnesses to the defendant after the witness has been called by the Government but before he testifies; whereas the original bill does not call for the production of such statements until after the witness has testified on direct examination. That provision of the original bill, in my judgment, is quite unfair to the conduct of a proper defense of an accused in a Federal court charged with crime.

In the third place, my substitute amendment would make it clear that any oral or written statement made by a prospective witness to the Government must be produced for examination and for use on cross examination; whereas the provision of the bill is so restrictive that, in my judgment, it would be easy indeed for the Federal Government and the Department of Justice so to change their procedures that no such statement need ever be produced.

Finally, in the fourth place, my substitute amendment makes it abundantly clear that whatever action may be taken in the event the Government fails to produce its statements lies in the discretion of the trial court. I am sure that most of us who have had some experience in the trial of cases realize that that is the wise and just and proper place to leave such evidentiary questions for decision, rather than giving the trial judge what in the bill comes close to being a direction to strike the testimony of a witness and proceed with the trial if the Government fails to produce the statement if ordered to do so by the court.

Mr. President, I have been persuaded that it is wise to enact some legislation in view of the Jencks case opinion, but I feel we should pass a bill which merely clarifies the Jencks case opinion, and does not do a great many other things which, in my judgment, would tend to load the dice in a criminal trial in favor of the Government and against the defendant. I am confident none of my colleagues wants to do that if the matter is explained to him.

EXCISE TAXES ON DOMESTIC LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there will shortly be discussed on the floor of the Senate an amendment to the mica bill, which would provide a great increase in the tariff on lead and zinc. In order that Members of the Senate may have a better knowledge of some of the issues involved, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, August 8, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METALS IMPORT BILL PROVES HOT POTATO (By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, August 7.—The Eisenhower administration espouses the principle of freer trade, but it now is in the awkward position of leading the protectionist forces in the hottest foreign-trade fight of the current congressional session.

It maneuvered itself into this predicament by asking Congress to approve a bill that would place special excise taxes on imported lead and zinc. The measure, which now is awaiting an uncertain fate in the House Ways and Means Committee, is designed to bolster the sagging American lead and zinc industries.

The administration request has sparked bitter protests from each of the major lead- and zinc-producing countries within Congress. It has aroused the specter of a fundamental shift in the long-established reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

Influential Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee are deeply disturbed for they are convinced that the administration has bypassed the traditional relief provisions of the reciprocal-trade program and has opened the door to a flood of individual industry pleas for special Congressional assistance.

LOGROLLING SEEN

They reason that if Congress yields to entreaties to help the lead and zinc producers it will have no alternative but to help the fluorspar producers (who have already descended upon the lawmakers), the plywood manufacturers, the tuna fishermen, the cotton-textile manufacturers and all the innumerable industries that believe they are entitled to greater protection against foreign goods.

"The logrolling possibilities are tremendous," one Congressman said. "They'll not only try to trade votes to broaden the bill to include a large number of industries while it's before but it will be wide open if it ever reaches the floor."

For many Congressmen it conjures up nightmarish visions of the oldtime tariff-making days before reciprocal trade when Congress itself used to set the exact rates for the thousands of items that are imported into the United States.

They see no difference in principle, and little in legislative effect, between setting rates initially and setting rates for special industries that come in and beg for relief.

COURSE OF ACTION

The orthodox course for the lead and zinc industry would have been to appeal to the United States Tariff Commission for increased protection against imported metal.

The reciprocal trade act says the United States Tariff Commission then must determine whether an industry is being seriously injured and, if the answer is yes, the United States Tariff Commission must recommend corrective action to the President. The Chief Executive in turn has 60 days within which he can adopt, modify or reject the United States Tariff Commission's proposals.

As an alternative, the producers could have resorted to a relatively new section of the reciprocal trade law that directs the President to protect industries that are essential to national security.

Instead, they did neither, and the administration took the ball for the industry by submitting the lead and zinc tax bill.

The measure provides for sliding scale taxes. Foreign lead is to be taxed at 3 cents a pound when the domestic price is under 15 cents a pound, at 2 cents when the domestic price is between 15 cents and 16 cents at 1 cent when the domestic price is over 16 cents and is not to be taxed at all when

the domestic price reaches 17 cents. Foreign slab zinc is to be taxed at 2 cents a pound, 1½ cents, one-half or not at all, depending on whether the domestic price is under 12½ cents, between 12½ and 13½ cents, between 13½ and 14½ cents, or over 14½ cents.

Supporters of freer trade both within and outside Congress are genuinely mystified by the administration's decision to put forward the sliding scale relief bill in preference to having the producers follow the established reciprocal trade act procedures.

The explanation appears to lie in one of those compromises that seems practicable when they are made but which often lead to embarrassing consequences later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I call attention to an editorial published in the *Journal of Commerce* entitled "A Deceptive End Run." I also invite the attention of Senators to an editorial published in the *Washington Post* of Tuesday, August 13, entitled "Worse Than It Sounds," to which our very well-liked colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], replied in a letter to the editor entitled "Worse Than It Sounds." In this morning's *Washington Post* there appears a rebuttal to the reply of the Senator from Utah, entitled "Other Ways To Help."

I ask unanimous consent that all these matters be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Journal of Commerce* of August 12, 1957]

A DECEPTIVE END RUN

Congressional representatives of the western metal producing States are pushing hard for last-minute relief legislation to ease the current price woes of domestic zinc and lead producers.

They want a sliding scale of excise taxes—in effect, tariffs—to be levied on imported lead and zinc when prices for these metals produced from United States mines fall below 17 cents and 14½ cents per pound, respectively.

Congress should let this legislation die in committee, thereby lightening its calendar and speeding its summer adjournment.

Without attempting to prejudice the question of whether domestic lead and zinc producers are entitled to some Government relief, this newspaper believes strongly that this should not be given through the proposed kind of legislation.

Instead, the industry once more should turn to the Tariff Commission and try for relief through the procedures established for such purposes in the Trade Agreements Act. The Tariff Commission, once before in 1954, accepted the industry's plea for a higher tariff.

We are strongly opposed to the proposed special relief legislation because it would run counter to our trade policy and antagonize friendly nations essential to our defense, especially our neighbors to the north and south who supply a large proportion of needed lead and zinc imports.

Canada and Mexico not only are actually considered as part of our mobilization base but their purchases from us are running close to \$5 billion annually and exceed our imports from them considerably.

To legislate relief instead of resorting to the relief machinery available under the escape clauses of the Trade Agreements Act would come close to a repudiation of the 23-year-old law.

Moreover, the proposed internal tax would be a discriminatory excise tax and violate

our commitments under the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT).

Such piece of legislation would open the floodgates for a deluge of similar claims of protection through special legislation. The result would be a throwback to the days before 1930—something this newspaper would hate to see happen.

It is, of course, true that a liberal trade policy such as ours frequently leads to conflicts between interests of specific industry groups and the national interest. It is easy enough to proclaim the soundness of a liberal trade policy in general terms, particularly under the watchful eye of those economic groups that are vitally interested in our own farm and industrial exports. The difficulties do not start until one gets down to a discussion of specific industry problems.

National policy is faced with the continuing task of reconciling special interest with the goals of our national trade policy.

It is obvious that this will require some unpopular decisions. There is no such thing as a perfect formula for solving such problems. A considerable degree of administrative discretion enters into any decision, after the facts have been fully presented.

Since price declines frequently are the bone of contention in the case of tariff arguments brought up by raw materials producing industries, a special word of warning is indicated for such cases.

The temptation usually is great to bring about price stability through artificial interferences with supply and demand factors. Government stockpiling—for strictly military purposes and beyond—has been given more than one ride in the postwar period. It is overlooked all too often that such interferences can at best bring temporary relief. Usually, they lead to bigger headaches later on.

The domestic nonferrous metals producers who are now pushing for price relief should do a lot more soul-searching in this respect before they try to get Government support in alleviating foreign competition.

Should they succeed too well in keeping their prices up, they most certainly will further encourage substitution of aluminum, plastics, and other materials. Zinc, for instance, is not nearly as important a war material today as it was in World War II.

Actually, the decline in nonferrous metals prices is not just hitting the producers in this country; it is worldwide.

Moreover, the fact remains that, in many cases, substantial proportions of our own metals needs must be supplied by foreign sources. Thus, artificial price-raising efforts on our part take on a deliberate inflationary flavor. In this respect, the sliding scale feature is particularly unsound as it would encourage price instability and thereby encourage the search for substitute materials promising greater price stability.

Under these circumstances, we believe strongly that Congress should bury H. R. 8265 and tell the domestic lead and zinc producers to submit their case to the Tariff Commission—but to do so only after another session of careful soul searching.

[From the *Washington Post* of August 13, 1957]

WORSE THAN IT SOUNDS

It is difficult to work up much lay interest in the protection maneuvers of the lead and zinc industry, not the least of the problem being the semantic dullness of the topic. But there is nothing pedestrian about the movement now well afoot to make a virtual shambles of American trade policy in the process of affording a peculiar, not to say irregular form of Government subsidy for this industry. If this effort succeeds, it could well mark the beginning of the end of the progress of the last quarter century toward freer trade.

A little group of mining-State Congressmen and Senators with the skillful assistance of a former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Felix Wormser, may well deliver this blow to fundamental American policy in the next few days—unless Congress awakens to the situation. Hearings have been held in both the House and Senate on bills to put a sliding excise tax on imported lead and zinc—in other words, a tariff, to be effective whenever the prices of American lead and zinc fall below 17 and 14½ cents, respectively. Such relief, whether or not it can be justified in terms of the current domestic market slump, would circumvent the procedures of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and, as a discriminatory tax, constitute a flagrant violation of the United States obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Wormser, who has returned to the vice presidency of the St. Joseph Lead Co., succeeded in arranging this end-run during his official tour of duty here. Unaccountably, he somehow managed to obtain official State Department support. Since the State Department only 3 years ago was able to cite not 1 but 15 cogent reasons why this kind of protection for lead and zinc should not be adopted, some unusual influence apparently has been at work.

The objection is not merely that Canada, Mexico, and other friends of the United States which export lead and zinc to this country, and are already running heavy trade deficits, would be badly hurt. American industry might not really be helped. For there is a worldwide slump in some mineral prices, and rapidly changing technologies involving new and different demands for metals are partly to blame. Price supports for lead and zinc could well intensify the shift to other metals rather than stabilize the market. Most serious of all, if lead and zinc producers were permitted to blaze this new trail of protectionism through the reciprocal trade agreements machinery and policy, other domestic businesses which compete with imports might widen the breach until the free-trade movement was destroyed.

The House may get the lead-zinc bill this week. Senators from the mining States are standing by to seek concurrence if the House approves the measure, or to initiate it, if need be, by amending other revenue legislation. Congressional supporters of free trade ought to block this dangerous end-run without fail.

"WORSE THAN IT SOUNDS"

The 30,000 families throughout the country directly dependent upon the domestic lead-zinc industry, and additional thousands employed in related service industries, undoubtedly will not be amused at the efforts of the *Washington Post* to reduce the emergency facing this industry to semantic dullness. (Editorial, *Worse Than It Sounds*, August 13.)

They appropriately will conclude that it is your newspaper's position that the surviving domestic lead-zinc mines and mills should be permanently closed down and that their jobs and the other economic contributions of this basic industry should be exported to presumably more deserving mining areas overseas, all in the name of free trade.

By the same token, the lead-zinc miners and smelter workers in New Jersey, Missouri, Oklahoma, Montana, Utah, and other States could reasonably argue that it would contribute to the goals of free trade if we closed down the agricultural industry of Maryland and Virginia and depended for all our food needs in those States on lower-priced farm crops from our foreign neighbors. Is this good economics?

It may come as a surprise to you that prominent members of both of our labor political parties, labor unions, and many in-

dividuals and groups throughout the country are supporting the bipartisan move to save the domestic lead-zinc industry from utter ruin. Both major political parties favor a minerals program.

In 1956, the Democratic platform stated: "We recognize that a healthy mining industry is essential to the economy of the Nation, and therefore pledge immediate efforts toward the establishment of a realistic, long-range minerals policy. The Nation's minerals and fuels are essential to the safety, security, and development of our country." Another plank pledged support for depressed areas.

The 1956 Republican platform stated: "Minerals. Recognizing that a vigorous and efficient mineral industry is essential to the long-term development of the United States, and to its defense, we believe the Federal Government should foster a long term policy for the development and prudent use of domestic mineral resources, and to assure access to necessary sources abroad, without dangerously weakening the market for domestic production of defense-essential materials * * *."

The Tariff Commission unanimously affirmed in 1954 the need for protection for the lead-zinc industry under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. The action proposed by the Tariff Commission actually went further than the program recommended by the administration. The industry has been in serious straits since 1953, an emergency condition alleviated only by stop-gap Federal purchasing under the stockpiling and barter programs.

Prior to World War II, the Nation consumed only 542,000 tons of zinc and 612,000 tons of lead. By 1956, this consumption had doubled—to 988,000 tons of zinc and 1,182,000 tons of lead—in face of the competition of other minerals, emphasized in your editorial.

In spite of this vast increase in consumption, however, domestic production has been losing ground. The expanded market has been filled largely by foreign imports. Zinc imports increased 23-fold from 33,000 tons prior to 1940, to 771,000 tons in 1956, and lead imports increased from 48,000 tons prior to World War II to 513,000 tons last year.

Domestic producers do not want to eliminate the foreign supply; they merely want to share adequately in the expanding domestic market.

This subject is important to my State, because mining is one of our major industries. And our major industries are limited because our population is small and the Federal Government owns or controls 70 percent of the land surface and 80 percent of the State's mineral wealth. In the Federal District of Columbia, by contrast, Uncle Sam owns only 29 percent of the real estate.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—The District Commissioners recently reported that the Federal Government owns 42.8 percent of land area of the District.]

If your boredom with this subject will permit, this is a brief summary of how foreign imports have largely choked out, in my State, an important industry which is marginal only because American mines pay American level wages and meet other costs of operation that foreign producers are spared. In 1948, 56 Utah lead-zinc operations produced ore. Today, only one major mine continues to operate at a level near normal operations. Three others operate on a greatly reduced basis. All the rest have closed down and the jobs, service industries, and taxes they provided have been exported to foreign lands, which also have been provided considerable mineral exploration and production assistance through our foreign aid program.

Are we contributing to a dangerous end run by advocating that we modify our import regulations to stabilize an essential defense industry? We of the growing bipartisan movement supporting this administra-

tion-recommended program don't think so. We believe that the country, at long last, is waking up to the realization that we can provide a large market for foreign trade, without jettisoning vital domestic industries. No other nation ignores its vital self-interest in drafting trade policies. Why should we?

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator, Utah.

WASHINGTON.
(See editorial Other Ways to Help.)

[From the Washington Post of August 19, 1957]

OTHER WAYS TO HELP

Senator WATKINS, in a letter published today, incorrectly accuses us of suggesting that the hard-pressed lead and zinc industry in this country "should be permanently closed down" and its business "exported" to foreign mines. The point of the Post's editorial, "Worse Than It Sounds," was, rather, that any relief that may be in order for the domestic lead-zinc industry ought not to be provided by making a shambles of American trade policy. And a shambles is precisely what would be made of it if the sliding-scale import tax on lead and zinc proposed in a bill before the Senate should become law.

This method of relief would circumvent the escape clause provisions and procedures of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It would violate the United States obligation, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, not to impose what amounts to an excise tax on imported goods without similarly taxing the same goods from domestic sources. It would invite unregulated and perhaps disastrous retaliation against American exports. It would work great hardship on Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Australia, which supply some 40 percent of our lead and 65 percent of our zinc requirements. In time of war, Mexican and Canadian production would be as vital to this country as its own supply of these minerals.

There is considerable unemployment and some hardship in the lead, zinc, and copper-mining States. It has not been established that imports are altogether to blame. A year ago prices were high and there was even fear of shortages. American mines and mills seem to have overproduced, and so there is naturally a need now for retrenchment. Imports, as well as domestic production, have fallen off. Nevada's Governor, Charles Russell, may even be right in suggesting that his State must solve the problem by seeking other industries.

But certainly, if protection against imports is to be a part of the answer, the remedy lies in a renewed escape clause hearing by the Tariff Commission and in follow-up action consistent with established American trade policy. Perhaps even emergency production bonuses, as proposed by Representative BARING of Nevada, could be justified. In these and other ways less destructive of the carefully constructed system under which the free world is moving toward freer, nondiscriminatory trade relationships, ample remedy may be found for the plight of the lead and zinc producers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I have prepared minority views, pointing out why the proposed increase in the tariff is prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. When those views are available, I shall also ask that they be included in the RECORD.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there has been some reference in the press, and also some concern ex-

pressed, as to whether paragraph (g) of section 102 of the so-called civil-rights bill would imperil newspaper reporters who on their own initiative and by their own ability obtained information concerning evidence or testimony given at an executive session of the Civil Rights Commission. The difficulty arises under the rules of both the Senate and the House which provide that language in a bill which has not been changed by either House may not be altered by conferees.

I believe an answer can be found by an addition to the amendment which was adopted to section 105, relating to the powers of the Commission. That amendment of the Senate, which is numbered 7, struck out certain language and inserted the following:

(b) The Commission shall not accept or utilize services of voluntary or uncompensated personnel.

The problem which arises with respect to paragraph (g), and the \$1,000 fine provided therein, to which fear is expressed that reporters may become liable, could be corrected by adding to the amendment No. 7 which I have read, these words:

And the term "whoever" as used in paragraph (g) of section 102 hereof shall be construed to mean a person whose services are compensated by the United States.

Mr. President, the reason I believe that language would reach the problem is that paragraph (g) states:

No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases or uses in public without the consent of the Commission evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year.

Since it is proposed by the amendment already adopted by the Senate to provide that "the Commission shall not accept or utilize services of voluntary or uncompensated personnel," the only persons who would be present at an executive session would be employees compensated by the United States.

Secondly, if we add to paragraph (b), which reads "The Commission shall not accept or utilize services of voluntary or uncompensated personnel," the words "and the term 'whoever' as used in paragraph (g) of section 102 hereof shall be construed to mean a person whose services are compensated by the United States," it would automatically exclude reporters of newspapers or radio or other media of public information.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to say that I am very anxious to have this difficulty resolved. I am glad the Senator from South Dakota has devoted his time in trying to resolve it. I hope it may be resolved so that the section in the bill will clearly make it possible for a newspaper reporter to develop a story without being in danger because he does so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under a rule which the House sometimes adopts, the House takes a bill from the desk of the Speaker to the end—and the term

"to the end" is used—that amendments of the Senate be concurred in, or that amendments of the Senate be agreed to with certain amendments.

The adoption of that rule takes the place of a conference. If it is a concurrence with an amendment, then the additional amendment would have to come to the Senate for concurrence in the modification.

That is why I am suggesting this procedure, since it has been suggested that the House is considering the possibility of a rule which would concur with certain amendments, presumably limiting the jury-trial provision to criminal contempt cases arising under the act itself.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to hear the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator will remember that I called to the attention of the Senate this very grave problem. I hope it will be worked out in a way which will be permissible under the rules of the House. All of us should be very grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for making the suggestion, which is so obviously based on careful and considered judgment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from New York. He is familiar with the rules of the House and knows the parliamentary problem which exists.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a call of the calendar of measures to which there is no objection from the beginning of the calendar, tomorrow, immediately after the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding our foreign policy situation, especially as it is affected by the fact that, as I understand, the Senate Committee on Appropriations is today in the process of marking up the mutual security appropriation bill for next year.

Mr. President, in the other body the mutual security appropriation bill was both raided and gutted. Let us hope that does not happen in this body. We are convinced that it should not, based upon the tradition of this body, and especially in view of the fact that this morning the Nation faces some very serious foreign problems.

For example, in the lead editorial in today's issue of the New York Times we are told that the "little war" in Oman, in a part of the world which produces vast quantities of oil, which is of such great importance "was instigated and organized on the soil of some of the com-

plaining Arab States in order to overthrow another Arab ruler."

Mr. President, let me say parenthetically that I have heard the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] attribute our troubles in the Middle East to our refusal to go along with the Aswan Dam proposal. I disagree, and on another occasion I hope to spell out my disagreement in great detail.

But it seems to me that this is a small indication of why we are in trouble in the Middle East, namely, the fact that a spear point for the Communists, in the shape of President Nasser, of Egypt, is fomenting difficulties such as that in Oman.

Second, Mr. President, I refer to an article entitled "Devil Takes the Hindmost," written by Joseph Alsop, and published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune. In the article Mr. Alsop points out that we are in grave trouble with respect to the Western Alliance, and that our trouble exists because "we have got to make it clear that the Western Alliance really is an alliance, a true partnership."

Mr. President, what we do in the case of the mutual security appropriations will determine whether we can convince our allies that, backed by the hard fact of the appropriation of our funds, we are really participating in that partnership, and that we are not pulling out.

Certainly the difficulties with respect to mutual security are very great. It would be easy to say, "That is said every year"; but it is a fact that peace is threatened every year, and right now everyone recognizes the danger of the creation of a conflagration in the Middle East, by means of such little wars as the one to which I have referred—that in Oman—as well as by means of the difficulty in Algeria and other difficulties in that area of the world, such as the disturbances to the Arab-Israel peace, and so forth.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee, with its customary sense of responsibility, will, today as it marks up the mutual security appropriation bill, bear in mind that right here, where we can control it, lies a most serious danger to our foreign policy; and I hope our Appropriations Committee will respond in that spirit.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the lead editorial, entitled "The U. N. and the Mideast," from today's issue of the New York Times; and also the article to which I have referred, written by Joseph Alsop, and published today in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 19, 1957]

THE U. N. AND THE MIDEAST

The "little war" in Oman, precipitated by a revolt against the ruling sultan by a shadowy Imam backed by a few hundred primitive tribesmen, has virtually come to an end. The British and the Trucial Oman troops, which helped the sultan to squelch the re-

volt, are preparing to leave. A few rebels who have fled to the mountains may still cause minor trouble. But for the present at least the authority of the sultan has been reestablished more firmly than before, and the dangerous potentialities of the conflict have been abated.

However, this "brush fire" war was only part of a wider struggle over the Middle East involving not only this vital region but also the big powers. This struggle, which affects the economic stability of oil-thirsty Europe as well as the strategic security of the western alliances, and could affect victory in the whole cold war, continues. The next round in it is scheduled for tomorrow before the Security Council of the United Nations.

It will be staged there because 10 Arab States persist in an appeal to the Security Council to take action in the dying Oman conflict on the ground that the British intervention in it endangers international security and peace. They accuse Britain of waging a "full-scale war of aggression" in Oman and warn that its continuance could lead to "serious consequences." In so doing they also indict the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, whose sovereignty over an autonomous Oman has long been recognized and who called his British treaty partners to his aid. Indeed, by asserting the "independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of the Imamate of Oman" they give open support to the rebels against the sultan whose rule may be medieval but is still far in advance of anything the primitive rebels could offer.

The British rightly oppose any United Nations intervention on the ground that it would mean interference in affairs falling under the sultan's sovereignty. But, if the Security Council should insist on dealing with the matter, it would be duty bound to deal, first of all, with the causes of the conflict. These causes are evident.

The revolt was instigated and organized on the soil of some of the complaining Arab States in order to overthrow another Arab ruler. It was armed with weapons smuggled from these Arab States and was backed by propaganda radiated from Cairo, the rebel headquarters. How far Saudi Arabia is involved is still unclear. But there is no doubt that the real power behind the revolt has been President Nasser, of Egypt, and behind Nasser stands Soviet Russia. Both Nasser and the Soviets have sought to utilize this vest-pocket revolt to strike at Britain and the West, to sow seeds of potential dissension between Britain and the United States, and to reduce the other Arab States to puppets serving Nasser's ambition of creating, by grace of the Soviets, a pan-Arabic and ultimately a pan-Islamic empire.

The appeal to the United Nations is obviously designed to carry this effort from the miniature stage of Oman to a world forum. It has been organized by the Arab League, dominated by Nasser and is signed not only by Egypt but also by Soviet-armed Yemen and pro-Soviet Syria, now controlled by a pro-Communist clique that is waging diplomatic war against the United States. Curiously enough, it is also signed by Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, who only recently joined forces to squelch an Egyptian-Syrian-Communist plot to overthrow Jordan's ruler, and even by Morocco, no member of the Arab League.

But whatever the motives behind these signatures, it would be a self-stultifying farce for the United Nations to back up the Nasser-Soviet plot. It would sanction every subversive force in the Middle East and would not only further reduce the authority of this world organization but would also create new possibilities for new explosions. That is not the function of the United Nations, and the Security Council must act accordingly.

[From the New York Tribune of August 1, 1957]

DEVIL TAKE THE HINDMOST
(By Joseph Alsop)

PARIS.—Unnoticed, undebated, an extremely grave question is beginning to confront the American policymakers. Is it really safe to let the Western Alliance, the sole defense of freedom in the world, decay into a mere loose confederation or, worse still, into a transparent false front?

The signs of decay are plain to be seen by anyone who spends much time, as this reporter has lately been doing, in England and France. There are plenty of these signs, such as the prevalence of a vague but captious anti-Americanism, the specific and widespread distrust of the present American leadership, including President Eisenhower himself, and the almost universal, personal detestation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles (who is now the most disliked man in Europe since Josef Stalin).

The desire to be liked is the worst of all follies in foreign relations. Hence these surface signs of Western disunity might safely be ignored if it were not for one practical point of high importance. The increasing distrust of the American leadership is increasingly causing serious policy divergencies among the Western Allies.

Great efforts have been made, notably by Secretary Dulles, to plaster over the underlying disunity with an appearance of concord. But the policy divergencies are there, none the less. They are getting worse. And it is time to ask the reason for this distrust of the American leadership that is so weakening the West.

In the opinion of this reporter, there is one main reason. The American leadership is now distrusted because the Eisenhower administration has seemed so totally uninterested in the central problem confronting our British and French allies. This is the problem of their changing power status. These two great nations once led the civilized world. Today, they are more and more reduced to powers of the second rank. They, and we too, have to decide what to do about this decline in their power.

The problem comes in two parts. The first and most obvious part is the progressive loss of the British and French imperial and colonial position. Despite the glib slogans so often quoted, empires are still possible to maintain intact—witness Hungary. But the British, who very carefully made a Hungary in India just a hundred years ago, when mutiny was drowned in a bath of blood, have now lost the stomach for this sort of thing. And so have the French.

All the same, neither the British nor the French like to face these unpleasant facts—though they are always complaining of American pressure, or in the case of the French in north Africa, American plots. We tend to be blamed, in fact, for results that were unavoidable in any case, given modern, civilized westerners' distaste for making Hungarians.

As for the second part of this problem of our allies' changing power status, it goes even deeper. It stems from the simple fact that only a giant national economy can afford the gigantic expenditures needed to maintain a complete panoply of fully modern weapons.

As a case in point, consider the British defense program as elaborated by the new Minister of Defense, Duncan Sandys, since the end of the Suez crisis. This program is squarely based on distrust of the United States. America, Sandys argued, cannot be trusted to stand by her trans-Atlantic allies when American cities are directly threatened by Soviet ballistic missiles with H-bomb warheads. Hence Britain, to defend herself and Europe, must sacrifice everything to possess her own thermo-nuclear deterrent.

Starting with this premise, the Sandys program will leave Britain almost fully naked of the conventional armed forces Britain still needs to protect her still-considerable overseas interests. In this way, too, the program will seriously weaken NATO. All this will be done in order to make funds available for the British grand deterrent.

But in fact, even after these sacrifices, Britain almost certainly cannot afford to keep the grand deterrent up to date without a far larger outlay than Sandys contemplates. But the time Britain has long-range aircraft with H-bombs, Britain will actually need long-range aircraft plus H-bombs plus air-to-ground missiles to carry the H-bomb from the aircraft to their distant targets. The ballistic missile state will come after that. And at every stage, the strain of keeping really abreast of these fantastically costly weapons developments will be too great for the British Treasury.

In sum, the new British defense program is an instinctive rather than a rational reaction to one part of the problem of Britain's changing power status. By the same token, another part of this same problem provoked an almost wholly instinctive reaction at Suez.

"Well, whose fault is that?" would most probably be the Eisenhower administration's comment. But this is a wholly insufficient comment from the leading power of the West. Britain and France cannot make wise adjustments to their new roles in the world without American wisdom to help them. The United States, above all, has got to make two things clear.

We have got to make it clear that we really are determined to safeguard all our allies' interests which it is humanly possible to safeguard (although not to the extent of trying to maintain impractical colonial situations). More important still, we have got to make it clear that the Western Alliance really is an alliance, a true partnership. And for this such measures are needed as an amendment of the MacMahon Act, to permit a sensible distribution of the tasks of common defense.

If we do not do these things, then, "Save yourselves and the devil take the hindmost," will soon be the watchword inside Western Alliance. And the United States will then suffer quite as much as all the other allies.

**EIGHTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY OF
BERNARD M. BARUCH**

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to take some of the time of the Senate to congratulate a very great man, Bernard Baruch, whose birthday is today and of whom we in New York are very proud. Today he is 87 years of age.

I should like to quote only one sentence from his traditional birthday interview, which is now almost historic in our country. He said:

If I had one wish to be granted me, I should like to see a start made toward permanent peace in the world.

Mr. President, considering Mr. Baruch's considerable contributions to the Baruch plan, which remains the fundamental basis for American policy with respect to disarmament as it affects the atom bomb and other weapons of major destruction, I think Mr. Baruch is one man who has a right to make that statement. I hazard the guess that all of us would hope to live so many honored years and to have at his age the brightness of mind, the sprightliness and spirit, and the idealism reflected in that statement alone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the editorial entitled "Congratulations to a Great Man," which was published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune, in extending congratulations to Mr. Baruch; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the news story from the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 19, 1957]

CONGRATULATIONS TO A GREAT MAN

Bernard M. Baruch is 87 years old today. A little rapid calculation will show that he was born in 1870, only 5 years after the end of the American Civil War, when the world was far different from the world we know today. Generations have come and gone, nations have fallen and risen, the United States has undergone an unparalleled transformation. Yet through it all Bernard Baruch has remained a fixed point of sagacity, generosity, and kindness. Particularly in recent years have his birthdays been an occasion for rejoicing and felicitations in which the leaders of men and the masses of men join.

One can sense Mr. Baruch's unique place on the American scene from the affectionate titles which have been bestowed upon him. "Adviser to Presidents," "elder statesman," "park-bench philosopher"—these friendly appellations are applied in a quite literal way to Mr. Baruch, and they are quite as accurate in the nuclear age as they were in bygone eras.

Bernard Baruch remains today what he was years ago—the genius of common sense. It is a quality that has stood him—and through him, his country—in good stead through years of strife and struggle and of wrestling with momentous problems. If his counsel has been sought—and accepted—by one President of the United States after another, surely it is because of this pervading quality of commonsense and reasonableness. Changing fads, fashions and fancies have in no wise diminished Mr. Baruch's enviable ability to cut through the heart of the matter to essentials, to propose courses and offer counsel that make sense.

Mr. Baruch's faith in America's future is as unshakable as his belief in the principles that have made this country great. He has never succumbed to despair or to pessimism. And the personification he himself offers of the thinking, sensitive man strengthens the confidence of others in humanity's capacity to win through to brighter days. It is an honor to be a contemporary of Bernard Baruch, and to salute him as he reaches another milestone in a great career.

[From the New York Times of August 19, 1957]

BARUCH, 87, LONGS FOR WORLD PEACE—HIS ONE WISH IS TO SEE A START WITH HIS ATOMIC PLAN OR SOMETHING LIKE IT—URGES UNITED GERMANY—ALSO WARNS THAT INFLATION MUST BE HALTED THROUGH THE HELP OF EVERYONE

(By Ira Henry Freeman)

OLD WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, August 18.—At the age of 87, Bernard Baruch's dearest wish is to see the dawn of world peace.

On the eve of his birthday, the financier and adviser to presidents discussed here today war and peace, control of atomic energy, the future of Germany, inflation, the stock market, and superfluous birthdays.

"If I had one wish to be granted me, I should like to see a start made toward permanent peace in the world," he said at the home of a friend, Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, where he is visiting. "Agreements between nations will not guarantee it."

"There must be an international authority which owns all the natural resources and fissionable materials required to wage atomic war. The authority must also have control of the necessary scientific and metallurgical processes."

WANTS BOMBS MADE HARMLESS

"Then all the world's atom bombs must be handed over to the authority for debombing. The danger of contamination by fallout is thus eliminated because there would be no testing of atomic weapons. All atomic energy will be utilized for peaceful purposes."

That was the essence of the Baruch plan for atomic control, which the Soviet Union rejected.

"They will come to it, or something like it, in the end," Mr. Baruch continued confidently. "I believe that public opinion, the Russian people, will eventually force their leaders to approve it."

The reunification of a peaceful, neutral Germany also is essential to peace between the Soviet and the North Atlantic Treaty powers, Mr. Baruch said, adding:

"The Russians are afraid of Germany, because a strong, united Germany can knock the stuffing out of them. But it is as important to us to keep Germany out of Russia's hands as it is to them to keep Germany out of our hands. Don't ask me how without war."

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

On the domestic scene, inflation remains the greatest danger, in Mr. Baruch's opinion.

"Inflation means spending money for something unproductive or nonessential," he said, wagging a long finger. "Spending money for development of resources, or adding real wealth, promoting the health, education, or security of the people is not inflationary. We are all guilty of not controlling inflation—you, me, everybody. Not just the politicians. Although they all say we should—too late. Why don't they do it when they have the power?"

"I warned against removing price controls too soon after World War II. Your paper—the New York Times—was as active in beating down that proposal as anybody."

"More recently George Humphrey warned that the Government was spending too much money. He was Secretary of the Treasury for 4 years; why didn't he do something about it then? But none of us are willing to discipline ourselves. Control the other fellow, we say."

"Now don't make me sound like Old Citizen Fix It, telling everybody what's wrong with everything and how to improve it."

AS ENERGETIC AS EVER

The famous stock market trader and Government fiscal expert is still as keen, outspoken, and energetic as ever. He still thinks fast, talking to the point and in a rush, while his hands make vigorous gestures that recall his youth as an amateur boxer. His bony, 6-foot-3 frame may bend slightly now, but he walks like a young man, rides gaily about the grounds on a golf cart, and swims in a pool every day.

Telegrams of congratulation from the great and nongreat who are his friends have begun to arrive from all over the world. But he prefers not to discuss them.

The first volume of his autobiography, carrying his life story up to World War I, will be issued tomorrow.

"I tried to write of the past with no bull as I lived it, because of the lessons it may teach young people today," he said. "The past is only of value as it guides us tomorrow."

Mr. Baruch will spend tomorrow quietly, working on the second volume and handling his own correspondence. He will be visited by his children—Mrs. Belle Wilcox, Mrs. Rene M. Samstag, and Bernard M. Baruch Jr. But there will be no party.

"Who the hell wants to celebrate an 87th birthday," he demanded. "That's all right for youngsters of 60 or 70."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUSPENSION OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, under rule VIII, be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is House bill 9131, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of that bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gore	Morse
Allott	Green	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Beall	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Javits	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clark	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cotton	Langer	Stennis
Curtis	Lausche	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Talmadge
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Monroney	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]

and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is absent on official business attending the Economic Conference of the Organization of American States at Buenos Aires.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate to represent the Senate at the Latin American Economic Conference in Buenos Aires.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALLMADGE in the chair). A quorum is present.

FACILITATION OF PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT CHECKS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1799.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1799) to facilitate the payment of Government checks, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of the act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 308; 31 U. S. C. 132), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That (a) all checks heretofore or hereafter drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, including those drawn by wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, shall be payable without limitation of time: *Provided*, That where on presentation of any check for payment the Treasurer of the United States is on notice of a doubtful question of law or fact the payment of such checks shall be deferred pending settlement by the General Accounting Office.

"(b) The amount of all checks drawn by authorized officers of the United States on designated depositaries which have not been paid prior to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which the checks were issued shall be withdrawn from the accounts with such depositaries and deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for credit to a consolidated account or accounts on the books of the Treasury. Claims for the proceeds of such unpaid checks shall be payable from such consolidated accounts by checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States pursuant to settlement by the General Accounting Office.

"(c) The limitation imposed in respect to certain claims or demands against the United States by the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061; 31 U. S. C. 71a, 237), shall not be deemed to apply to original or substitute checks heretofore or hereafter drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, including those drawn by wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, or drawn by authorized officers of the United States on designated depositaries."

Sec. 2. Section 3 of the act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 309; 31 U. S. C. 134), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer, at appropriate intervals, amounts of unpaid checks from the accounts on which drawn to a consolidated account or accounts on the books of the Treasury and to transfer to such consolidated account or accounts the balance of the special deposit account established pursuant to section 1 of the act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 308), which consolidated account or accounts shall be available for the payment of such checks and any unpaid checks heretofore payable from the special deposit account. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to transfer, at appropriate intervals, from the accounts available for the payment of unpaid checks to the appropriate receipt account on the books of the Treasury any amounts not required for the payment of such checks and with the concurrence of the Comptroller General to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the administration of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in the case of checks issued by the disbursing officers of the District of Columbia and the disbursing officer of the Corps of Engineers in reference to the disbursement of District funds, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer, at appropriate intervals, from the accounts available for the payment of such unpaid checks, to the general revenues of the District of Columbia, any amounts not required for the payment of such checks: *Provided further*, That as to such checks issued on or before June 30, 1955, transfers to the general revenues of the District of Columbia shall be limited to the amount of undelivered checks."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 2 of the act of June 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 761; 31 U. S. C. 122), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Hereafter all claims on account of any check, checks, warrant, or warrants appearing from the records of the General Accounting Office or the Treasury Department to have been paid, shall be barred if not presented to the General Accounting Office or the Treasurer of the United States within 6 years after the date of issuance of the check, checks, warrant, or warrants involved. However, any claims for the proceeds of checks payable in Philippine pesos heretofore issued in payment of claims certified by the Philippine War Damage Commission, shall not be barred if received by the representative of the Chief Disbursing Officer, United States Treasury Department, at Manila, Republic of the Philippines, within 6 years after the date of issuance of such checks."

(b) Section 1 of the act of March 6, 1946 (60 Stat. 31; 31 U. S. C. 129), is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the words "General Accounting Office" the words "or the Treasurer of the United States."

Sec. 4. Subsection (a) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 528 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in this section, whenever it is clearly proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that any original check of the United States is lost, stolen, or wholly or partly destroyed, or is so mutilated or defaced as to impair its value to its owner or holder, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue to the owner or holder thereof against funds available for the payment of the original check a substitute showing such information as may be necessary to identify the original check, upon receipt and approval by the Secretary of the Treasury of an undertaking to indemnify the United States, in such form and amount and with such surety, sureties or security, if any, as the Secretary of the Treasury may require; but no such substitute shall be payable if the original

check shall first have been paid: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to relieve any certifying officer or his sureties or any disbursing officer or his sureties of any liability to the United States on account of any payment resulting from the erroneous issuance of the original check."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (c) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 528 (c)), is further amended by deleting the phrase "prior to the expiration of 10 years from the date on which the original check was issued" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which the check was issued."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 528 (e)), is further amended by deleting the phrase "prior to the expiration of 10 years from the date on which the original check was issued."

(c) Subsection (f) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (61 Stat. 310; 31 U. S. C. 528 (f)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(f) Substitutes issued under this section drawn on the Treasurer of the United States shall be deemed to be original checks and payable under the same conditions as original checks."

SEC. 6. Section 2 of the act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 309; 31 U. S. C. 133), and section 5 of the act of July 1, 1916, as amended (61 Stat. 309; 31 U. S. C. 154), are hereby repealed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1791.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1791) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U. S. C. 133 z-3), as last amended by the act of March 25, 1955 (69 Stat. 14), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1959."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U. S. C. 133 z-4) is amended by striking out "by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree with the House amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HUM-

PHREY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. CAPEHART conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee considered budget estimates totaling \$1,973,767,827, which includes \$113,018,860 that was not considered by the House of Representatives.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations recommends appropriations totaling \$1,820,351,547 which is an increase of \$238,760,960 over the House bill, and a decrease of \$153,416,280 under the budget estimates.

Two items account for more than \$200 million of the increase over the House bill. They are, first, Small Business Administration, \$100 million. This estimate was not considered by the House; and second, military construction, \$104 million.

The action of the committee with respect to each appropriation is set forth in the report accompanying the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as the original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator agree to a separate vote on the matter involving \$12,500,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be done under the request I am making. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Could we have a separate vote on the Burke Airport item?

Mr. HAYDEN. There can be no question about that. There would be no objection to that procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, to insert:

"CHAPTER I

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Agricultural Research Service

"Salaries and Expenses

"Plant and animal disease and pest control
"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and Expenses', for 'plant and animal disease and pest control', \$5 million."

On page 2, after line 7, to insert:

"Agricultural conservation program service
"Emergency Conservation Measures

"For an additional amount for 'Emergency conservation measures', to be used for the

same purposes and subject to the same conditions as the funds appropriated under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, \$25 million."

On page 2, line 15, to change the chapter number from "I" to "II."

On page 3, after line 3, to insert:

"Coast and Geodetic Survey

"Construction of a Surveying Ship

"For an additional amount for 'Construction of a surveying ship', \$3,456,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"Bureau of Public Roads

"Public Lands Highways

"Liquidation of contract authorization

"For payment of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authorization granted by section 6 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 73) and section 106 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 376), to remain available until expended, \$1,533,000, which sum is composed of \$225,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957, and \$1,308,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1958."

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

"Weather Bureau

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', \$372,100."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"THE PANAMA CANAL

"Panama Canal Company

"Panama Canal Bridge

"For expenses necessary for work preliminary to the construction of a high-level bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa, Canal Zone, as authorized by the act of July 23, 1956 (70 Stat. 596), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 4, after line 8, to insert:

"INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

"Advisory Committee on Weather Control

"To complete its final report to the President and the Congress as provided by law, \$175,000: *Provided, however, That the Committee shall complete its report and terminate its activities by December 31, 1957, and turn its records over to the National Science Foundation, together with any unexpended balances.*"

On page 4, after line 16, to insert:

"Small Business Administration

"Salaries and Expenses

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$2,570,000; and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed \$8,590,000 from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed \$490,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation disaster loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided, That the amount authorized for transfer from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans: Provided further, That 10 percent of the amount authorized to be transferred from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out the business loan program.*"

On page 5, after line 18, to insert:

"Revolving Fund

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitations, \$100,000,000."

On page 6, line 1, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III."

Under the heading "Department of Defense—Military Functions—Department of the Army—Military Construction, Army" on page 7, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$305,000,000" and insert "\$315,000,000."

Under the subhead "Military Construction—Army Reserve Forces", on page 7, line 23, after the word "vehicles" to strike out "\$46,000,000" and insert "\$55,000,000."

Under the subhead "Department of the Navy—Military Construction, Navy", on page 8, line 17, to strike out "\$265,000,000" and insert "\$300,000,000."

Under the subhead "Department of the Air Force—Military Construction, Air Force", on page 9, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$900,000,000" and insert "\$950,000,000."

Under the subhead "General Provisions", on page 9, line 12, to change the section number from "201" to "301."

On page 9, line 17, to change the section number from "202" to "302."

On page 9, line 23, to change the section number from "203" to "303."

On page 10, line 8, to change the section number from "204" to "304."

On page 10, line 16, to change the section number from "205" to "305."

On page 10, line 22, to change the section number from "206" to "306."

On page 11, line 5, to change the section number from "207" to "307."

On page 11, line 13, to change the section number from "208" to "308."

On page 11, line 21, to change the section number from "209" to "309."

On page 12, line 3, to change the section number from "210" to "310."

On page 12, line 11, to change the section number from "211" to "311."

On page 12, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 312. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to transfer to the 'Air Force industrial fund' not to exceed \$100 million from appropriations to the Department of Defense available for obligation during the fiscal year 1958."

On page 12, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 313. Section 612 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1958, Public Law 117, approved August 2, 1957, is amended by deleting the figures '\$41,000,000' in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof '\$45,000,000'."

On page 13, after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 314. The General Counsel of the Department of Defense shall be paid at the rate prescribed by Reorganization Plan No. 6 approved June 30, 1953 (67 Stat. 638)."

On page 13, line 3, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV."

Under the heading "Department of Defense—Civil Functions—Department of the Army—Administration, Ryukyu Islands", on page 13, line 25, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$2,410,000" and insert "\$2,475,000", and on page 14, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,340,000" and insert "\$1,405,000."

On page 15, after line 18, to insert:

"Construction of Power Systems, Ryukyu Islands

"For necessary expenses of construction, installation, and equipment of electric power systems in the Ryukyu Islands, which shall be operated by the Ryukyu Electric Power Corporation, an instrumentality of

the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); at rates not in excess of \$50 a day for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles and hire of aircraft; \$1,513,000 to remain available until expended, without regard to sections 355 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and title 10, United States Code, section 4774."

On page 17, line 13, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V."

Under the heading "Independent Offices—General Services Administration", on page 17, after line 21, to insert:

"Hospital Facilities in the District of Columbia

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, authorizing the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District, \$290,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided, That the limitation under this head in the act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 644), as amended, on the total amount to be provided for completion of grant projects, is increased from \$13,010,000 to \$13,300,000.*"

On page 18, line 20, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI."

Under the heading "Department of the Interior", on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

"Bureau of Land Management

"Construction

"Not to exceed \$1,423 of the funds available to the Bureau of Land Management from definite annual appropriations shall be available for reimbursing the city of Monticello, Utah, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Resources Management", on page 19, line 10, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$118,000" and insert "\$169,000", and in line 12, after the word "basis", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to expend income received from leases on lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation (southern and northern reserves) for the benefit of the Colorado River Indian Tribes and their members during the current fiscal year, or until beneficial ownership of the lands has been determined if such determination is made during the current fiscal year.*"

Under the subhead "Commission for a National Cultural Center—Salaries and Expenses", on page 20, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "The" and insert "Not to exceed 12,000 of the."

On page 20, after line 14, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Forest Service

"Forest Land Management: During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the acquisition of sites authorized by the act of March 3, 1925, as amended (16 U. S. C. 555), without regard to any other limitation on the amount available for this purpose."

At the top of page 21, to insert:

"CHAPTER VII

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Public Health Service

"Communicable Diseases

"Communicable diseases: For an additional amount for 'Communicable diseases', for emergency measures necessary for the further prevention and control of a threatened or actual epidemic of influenza, \$800,000: *Provided, That \$2 million may be*

transferred from funds appropriated for disaster relief pursuant to the act of September 30, 1950, chapter 1125, section 8 (64 Stat. 1109), for the purposes specified in this paragraph, including the purchase, without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes, and distribution of supplies and materials for prevention and control and grants to States of money and medical supplies and materials, upon a finding by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General and the National Advisory Health Council, that a threatened or actual epidemic of influenza constitutes an actual or potential health emergency of national significance."

On page 21, after line 21, to insert:

"Hospitals and Medical Care

"The limitation under this head contained in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act is increased by such sum or sums as may be necessary for the purpose."

On page 22, after line 3, to insert:

"Construction of Indian Health Facilities

"For an additional amount for 'Construction of Indian health facilities', \$34,000, for the construction of sewer and water facilities for the Elko Indian colony, Nevada."

On page 22, after line 7, to insert:

"General Provisions

"Section 210 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 224), is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, That this section shall not be applicable to assistance and consultation rendered by that Department in connection with the planning of a building for the use of the Food and Drug Administration at Washington, District of Columbia.'"

On page 22, line 17, to change the chapter number "VI" to "VIII."

On page 22, after line 18, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

"Construction, general

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', \$475,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 23, line 8, change the chapter number from "VII" to "IX."

Under the heading "Department of State—International Organizations and Conferences—Eleventh World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization", on page 23, line 16, after the numerals "832", to strike out "\$290,000" and insert "\$375,000."

On page 23, after line 16, to insert:

"Contributions to International Organizations

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, an additional contribution of \$5,696 to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference is authorized out of funds previously appropriated for 'Contributions to international organizations.'"

Under the subhead "Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Activities", on page 24, line 9, after the figures "\$3,525,000", to insert a colon and "Provided, That this amount shall be used for purchase of foreign currencies from the special account for the informational media guaranty program, at rates of exchange determined by the Treasury Department, but in no event at a higher rate per unit than the Free World market value of the currency purchased, and the amounts of any such purchases shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

Under the heading "The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judi-

cial Services," on page 24, after line 19, to insert:

"Salaries of referees

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries of referees,' \$10,000, to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of the act of June 28, 1946, as amended (11 U. S. C. 68)."

Under the subhead "Expenses of Referees," on page 25, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—President's Special International Program," on page 25, after line 7, to strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'President's special international program,' \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended."

And insert:

"For an additional amount for the 'President's special international program,' including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 2131), \$5,089,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this head in the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1958, for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, is increased from '\$6,500,000' to '\$9,389,000.'"

On page 25, line 21, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "X."

On page 26, line 3, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "XI."

On page 26, after line 19, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

"Department of Public Health, amounts equal to the cost of medical services rendered recipients of public assistance, without charge, may from time to time be transferred to the Department of Public Welfare for deposit into a fund, hereby established, for the purpose of matching Federal grants under the Social Security Act for payment for medical services as provided under that act, payment of related administrative expense, and return of any surplus to the general fund of the District of Columbia."

Under the subhead "Judgments," on page 28, line 9, after the word "in" to insert "Senate Document No. 57 and," and, in line 11, after the word "Congress" to strike out "\$15,038" and insert "\$44,128."

On page 29, line 10, to change the chapter number from "X" to "XII."

On page 29, after line 18, to insert:

"Architect of the Capitol

"Capitol Buildings and Grounds

"Furniture and furnishings, additional Senate Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to carry out the provisions of the act of July 10, 1957 (Public Law 85-93, 85th Cong.), authorizing furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate, authorized to be constructed and equipped by the Second Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), \$1 million, to remain available until expended."

On page 30, after line 5, to insert:

"Remodeling, Senate Office Building: To ward carrying out the provisions of the act of July 10, 1957 (Public Law 85-95, 85th Cong.), authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate, \$250,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated may be expended only for such work as can be done by the force of the Architect of the Capitol and that no part of such funds may be expended for planning

by architects or engineers not on the staff of the Architect of the Capitol."

On page 30, line 21, to change the chapter number from "XI" to "XIII."

Under the heading "Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments", on page 31, after line 18, to insert:

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 60, 85th Congress, \$753,860 together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

On page 32, line 13, to change the chapter number from "XII" to "XIV."

Under the heading "General Provision," on page 32, at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "1201" to "1401."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 33, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 1402. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act shall be available from July 1, 1957, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1957, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof, and the terms of Public Law 85-78, 85th Congress, as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, several of the appropriation bills were not passed until after July 1, the beginning of the current fiscal year. In order that the various agencies of the Government for which appropriations had not been approved could operate, the usual continuing resolution was passed.

The purpose of the amendment is to ratify and confirm all obligations incurred pursuant to that resolution. It is the usual provision which always follows a continuing resolution.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a group of young Americans are en route

behind the Bamboo Curtain in Red China.

Regardless of whether we approve or disapprove of the action taken by these young students in wanting to find out what it is like in China today, the fact remains that they are going. What we should now be concerned about is whether or not the American people are to be given an unbiased account of what they do, what they say, and how they are treated.

Must we rely only upon Communist news agencies for the story of these American students in Red China?

I think the American people have a right to have their own press, radio, and television correspondents on the scene to record this story objectively—to tell us what happens, and what the reactions of our young Americans are.

In Moscow recently, a few young Americans were able to embarrass the entire Soviet Union by doing a more effective job of publicly criticising Kremlin policy than anyone else has been able to get away with. Yet if it had not been for the American press representatives, we probably would not have known about it.

We have no correspondents in China—because of our own policies, not because of Red China's. The American press would welcome a chance to go and cover this story of American students. It may be vitally important to have such unofficial observers available to give us an objective report, in view of the fact we have no diplomatic representatives there.

Mr. President, the State Department has shown some wavering from its earlier ban on American correspondents in Red China. I respectfully suggest it would be advisable to immediately grant at least temporary emergency authorization for our own correspondents to fly to Red China at once, to keep us informed over what is happening to our American youth being escorted through Red China.

This statement is not to be interpreted as condoning the action of these young students in defiance of State Department policy. It is merely recognizing that the interests of the United States can best be served now by seeing that we get full reports from competent American journalists, rather than the distorted propaganda reports which will undoubtedly emanate from the Communist press services in China.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES— HIGH BORROWING COSTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also desire to invite the attention of the Senate to a letter I have received from a very responsible organization in my State, the Minnesota School Board Association, along with a press story. The letter indicates that there is no subject of more vital concern to the economic welfare of the American people than the monetary and fiscal policy of the Federal Government. Ever since March 1953, we have been witnessing ever-rising in-

terest rates and a tightening of credit, both of which have exacted a heavy price from borrowers and placed an ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayers.

The administration's high interest rate and tight credit policy is a matter of such public importance that the Congress of the United States is being repeatedly called upon to exercise its power over the value of money by calling a halt to the policies being pursued by the Eisenhower administration. The appeals for help are no longer coming only from farmers and small-business men, who were the first to feel the pinch of high interest and tight money policies. The appeals are now coming from local governmental institutions, particularly school boards who see much-needed public facilities jeopardized by the fiscal and monetary policies of this administration.

The Congress can no longer ignore these pleas and appeals. The borrowing policy, the tax policy, the interest rate policies, and the credit policies of the Federal Government require Congressional supervision. Money and credit are not the special privileges of the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, and the private banking institutions. Each of these institutions has its role to play, but under the Constitution they should not have and do not have exclusive jurisdiction over monetary and fiscal policy.

I invite to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star some week ago. This article states that the Minnesota School Board Association adopted a resolution urging President Eisenhower to investigate the high interest rates on school construction bonds. The Minnesota School Board Association also asked the President to take necessary steps to make money available to school districts at lower interest rates.

I take this means of informing the Minnesota School Board Association that it is the fiscal and monetary policies of the Eisenhower administration that are responsible for the high interest rate on school construction bonds. Furthermore, the President has not given leadership to make money available to school districts at lower interest rates. Every act and attitude of the Eisenhower administration is conducive to and in fact leads to higher interest rates on both public and private financing. Not only did the administration fail to give leadership in support of the Federal aid to school construction program, which is direly needed, but even worse, its policies retard and impede school construction due to the heavy financing costs of a school bond issue.

I also invite to the Senate's attention a letter which I have received from the Minnesota School Board Association under the date of August 8. This letter carries with it a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Directors of the Minnesota School Board Association. The resolution calls for the passage of Federal aid for school construction. It asks the Congress to enact legislation that will alleviate the high interest rates on school bond issues.

This resolution and letter are but further evidence of the growing anxiety and concern on the part of responsible local—and, may I add, conservative—public officials over the policies being pursued by the present administration.

I can assure, and have reassured, my constituents that I wholeheartedly support Federal aid for school construction—that I vigorously oppose the present high interest rate and tight credit policy of this administration—and that I shall do all I possibly can to make available to school districts financing at a rate of interest that is reasonable and fair and that takes into consideration the fact that local government bonds are tax exempt and, therefore, are a much more desirable investment to bond holders. Surely tax-exempt bonds should bear a much lower rate of interest than other securities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the newspaper article to which I have alluded in my comments be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION,
St. Peter, Minn., August 8, 1957.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to call to your attention action taken by the board of directors of the Minnesota School Board Association on Monday, August 5, 1957, during their regular monthly meeting. This action was taken by a unanimous vote, and I shall list the names and addresses of the board members at the conclusion of this letter.

"Whereas the recent Federal aid to school construction bill was killed by the United States House of Representatives; and

"Whereas the board of directors of the Minnesota School Board Association were not concerned with enactment of this legislation; and

"Whereas the board of directors did not believe that this bill was the answer to partial financing of public school construction; and

"Whereas the board of directors want to impress upon you, in spite of propaganda to the contrary, that there is a real need for assistance in school construction; and

"Whereas the board of directors believe that the property taxload is lending itself to the taxing many small communities out of existence; and

"Whereas the board of directors know from basis of fact that more and more school buildings will have to be built within the next 10 to 15 years; and

"Whereas the board of directors believe that the single major factor in the high school cost of school building, and the biggest factor in the rise of local property tax, is the high rate of interest that school districts are forced to pay on their bond issues; and

"Whereas some of the recent school bond sales have nearly reached 5 percent on the sale (Bloomington 4.897) be it

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minnesota School Board Association respectfully request the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Honorable Edward Thyne, the Honorable Hubert Humphrey, the Honorable August Andresen, the Honorable Joseph O'Hara, the Honorable Roy Weir, the Honorable Eugene McCarthy, the Honorable Walter Judd, the Honorable Fred Marshall, the Honorable H. Carl Andersen, the Honorable John Blatnik, and the Honorable

Coya Knutson, to investigate the situation as it exists in Minnesota and other States, and to enact legislation that will alleviate the high interest rates on school bond issues. The board of directors believe that one of the main reasons for the high rate of taxation is the inability of school districts to borrow money at a low rate of interest. They believe that an emergency exists in the field of public school education, and that taxpayers and supporters of the public school system, should not be penalized in their efforts to provide an education for the young people of Minnesota, or any other State. We believe that this problem of high interest is one that must be dealt with on a national level. We respectfully request your assistance in correcting this problem."

W. A. WETTERGREN,

Executive Secretary.

(Directors: Emery Lindesmith, Owatonna; Charles McCarthy, Madelia; R. A. Horton, Lindstrom; Mrs. Fred L. Paul, St. Paul; Miss Florence Lehmann, Minneapolis; Gordon Blume, Verndale; A. G. Sifert, Redwood Falls; Herbert Latvala, Nashwauk; Paul Olstad, Bemidji.)

IKE PROBE ASKED OF SCHOOL BOND CHARGES (By Herm Sittard)

The Minnesota School Board Association (MSBA) board of directors today passed a resolution urging President Eisenhower to investigate the high interest rates on school construction bonds.

They also asked the President to take necessary steps to make money available to school districts at lower interest rates.

The MSBA resolution will go to the President, the Cabinet Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Minnesota Congressional delegation.

MSBA directors discussed the interest rate of 4.98 percent on bonds voted recently by the Bloomington School Board for a \$500,000 construction loan.

William Wettergren, MSBA executive secretary, read a letter from State Treasurer Van Bjornson concerning the June 1 shutoff of State investment fund loans to school districts.

In previous years, the State investment board has approved loans of two to three million dollars annually for construction bonds. Current State interest rates are an attractive 3.25 percent.

MSBA had asked Bjornson for an explanation of the shutoff. In his letter, Bjornson pointed out loans made from the State investment fund have been relatively small in the past.

He cited an old statute declaring preference be given applicants seeking \$2,500 or less.

"Now for the first time in Minnesota history," Bjornson wrote, "the State will be carrying its own building certificates of indebtedness on to the open money market."

"We have been able to finance ourselves in the past * * * because building programs have been slow and gradual. Now we have a tremendous stepping up in tempo."

"The point has been reached * * * where the State cannot much longer finance itself."

Bjornson explained 85 percent or about \$54 million of the next school term's aids must be distributed just before Labor Day.

Wettergren reviewed the recent defeat, 208 to 203, of the Federal aid to education bill in Congress. The National Education Association, he noted, points to a conservative coalition of 111 Republicans and 96 Democrats opposing the bill as the reason for its failure, rather than the antisegregation amendment.

Lower interest rates on bond issues, commented Wettergren, would ease property taxes more than anything else.

Michael Ousdigan, executive director of the Public Employees Retirement Association, explained to the board the background of

the PERA Retirement Act passed by the 1957 legislature.

The new law permits a referendum October 15 in which some 33,000 public employees will decide whether they wish to continue under the PERA system or combine this with social security.

School boards of New Brighton District 38 and Tracy, Minn., have asked the MSBA to check the legality of retroactive features in this law and to challenge its constitutionality.

Thomas Quayle, executive director of the interim commission on recodification of school laws, has informed the MSBA he believes that the MSBA did not have the standing through which to challenge the law; but that an individual MSBA member might have such standing.

MSBA directors voted to ask their legal counsel how an individual member may challenge the PERA law.

BORROWING BY NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report on the record high borrowing costs of the Northern States Power Company of Minnesota, from the Wall Street Journal of August 14, be printed as a part of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am usually most pleased to announce to the Senate unusual achievements which take place within the great State of Minnesota. But in this particular case I am far from happy, for what I have to announce is that the Northern States Power Company of Minnesota recently had to pay 5.05 percent interest on \$18 million of first mortgage bonds. This is reported as probably being the highest rate since the early 1930's on long-term electric utility obligations of comparable quality.

Only 11 months ago, this same company sold a \$15 million block of bonds at 4.22 percent. In less than a year the rate has jumped from 4.22 percent to 5.05 percent—an increase of almost 20 percent.

This is a perfect illustration of the fact that the cost of borrowing money is rising faster than is the price of any other commodity on the market today. Here is real honest-to-goodness inflation, but the administration which preaches so piously on the danger of inflation for some strange reason does not seem concerned.

I suggest that the administration take a look at the real inflation which is taking place in the interest rate market. This is an Eisenhower inflation which cannot be denied, a price increase in the last 1 year of 20 percent. It is my opinion that no other commodity can show such an increase.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN STATES POWER \$18 MILLION BONDS
SOLD AT 5.05 PERCENT INTEREST COST—BORROWING CALLED COSTLIEST OF ITS KIND SINCE EARLY 1930'S; OFFERED PUBLICLY AT PAR

CHICAGO.—Northern States Power Co. of Minnesota accepted a 5.05-percent net interest cost to sell its \$18 million of first mortgage bonds, due August 1, 1957.

That rate marked the borrowings as probably the costliest since the early 1930's on

long-term electric utility obligations of comparable quality, investment bankers said.

Underwriters led by Blyth & Co., Inc., and First Boston Corp. took the 30-year securities from the block with a bid of 99.26 for a 5-percent coupon.

Following compliance with Securities and Exchange Commission requirements, the group is putting the bonds out for general distribution today at par. Indications were that the issue would be a quick success at retail.

Investment bankers compared yesterday's 5.05-percent borrowing cost for Northern States Power with the 4.70 percent Texas Electric Service Co. is paying for the \$16 million it raised July 15 on similarly rated 30-year obligations.

A borrowing cost of about 5 percent accepted by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on AA-rated securities July 23 was closer to yesterday's. But that \$60 million offering was more than 3 times as large and it came from a utility with much more debt paper outstanding in the hands of investors.

Other bids received by Northern States Power for its 30-year bonds as 5's came from: Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, Kidder, Peabody & Co. and White, Weld & Co., jointly, 99.239; Lehman Brothers and Riter & Co., jointly, 99.231, and Equitable Securities Corp. and Eastman Dillon, Union Securities & Co., jointly, 99.15.

Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc., bid 99.90 for a 5½-percent coupon.

The new bonds will be callable at the utility's option at 105 until July 31, 1958, and thereafter at prices ranging down to par.

On Northern States Power's last bond market trip, September 12, 1956, it sold a \$15 million block of 30-year 4½'s at 4.22 percent. The Minnesota utility will use the proceeds from yesterday's 5's to pay short-term construction loans and for more expansion.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the Treasury this year and in the last few weeks has sold securities on which the interest rate is 100 percent higher than the interest rate it had to pay and did pay on similar securities only 2 years ago?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of that.

Mr. KERR. As I have understood the President of the United States, when he has talked about an increase in the wages for Government employees, I believe that there are one or more bills before the Senate now designed to do that, has said he is opposed to any increases in the wages of Federal employees, because such increase would be inflationary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's interpretation of the President's position is accurate, according to my understanding.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator if he can figure out how it could possibly be so objectionable on the basis that it is inflationary, to raise the wages of Government employees from 7 to 10 or 11 percent, while at the same time favoring, implementing, and putting into effect a policy which thus increases the wages of money 100 percent, and saying that that is not inflationary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respectfully reply to the Senator from Oklahoma that the only ones who could possibly make that kind of a deduction from the facts

as presented would be the President and the administration, because if inflation means rising costs, and that apparently is what contributes to inflation, at least, then the rising cost of money is every bit as significant as the rising cost of materials and wages of employment. As the Senator so properly noted, interest is nothing more than rent on money, or wages of money. When we talk about the rise in interest rates as being non-inflationary and complain about the price of employment going up as being inflationary, it seems to me we are talking through our hats, or, should I say, out of both sides of the mouth.

Mr. KERR. Would it occur to the Senator that an administration which deliberately implements and puts into effect policies which increase the wages of money 100 percent in 2 years and which opposes any legislation to increase the wages of Government employees is following a policy which would indicate a very much higher respect and more tender feeling for money than for human beings?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's description is direct and to the point. What is happening indicates the kind of high regard for money which, I must say, most sincerely, has been characteristic of Republican policies throughout the history of our country.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is a very able authority on these matters and has given much time and thought to them. Is the Senator at this moment in a position to refer to any other period in the history of our country in which, during a brief time of 2 years, the administration has handled its fiscal affairs and monetary-control policies in such a way as deliberately to bring about an increase of 100 percent within a 2-year period in the wages of money, or specifically in the rate of interest paid on Government securities which are sold?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota cannot recall any other comparable period in which such a development occurred. We, of course, know that interest rates were higher in the 1920's and early 1930's, but in no period of 2 years has there been the sharp increase and tremendous inflation in interest rates we have witnessed in the past 2 years.

I add, with deep regret, that, just as the rates on money have gone up by official action of the Government—a kind of price support for money—the prices of farm commodities and levels of farm commodity price supports have gone down. It is a kind of paradox, but it is one which is characteristic of the developments we witnessed in the 1920's, as well as in recent days.

Mr. KERR. I am glad the Senator referred to that subject. I remind him that Mr. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury during these years, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, have been equally devoted to the principle of flexibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. One is flexed up, and the other is flexed down.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct. The Secretary of the Treasury has operated in such a way as to flex the in-

terest rates up. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is just as fully devoted to the principle of flexibility, has been just as determinedly, and successfully, engaged in flexing prices of agricultural products down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both Secretaries have exacted from the American people a great toll. The Secretary of Agriculture, by pursuing policies which are the epitome of economic trouble—and, if pursued long, they mean disaster for the American people—has exacted a toll of billions of dollars from American farmers, to the extent of a reduction in net income of almost \$4 billion a year, over a period of a little more than 4½ years. There has been an increase of more than \$4 billion in mortgage indebtedness, and a tremendous liquidation of farm assets. The American public has no idea of the great losses which were encountered and had to be endured by the American farmers under these disastrous policies.

On the money management side, the administration, through its Treasury policies, has exacted a toll of billions of dollars of losses to bondholders. Bonds which are supposed to be selling at 100 cents on the dollar are selling at 85, 86, and 87.

At the same time there has been placed on the backs of American taxpayers a great increase in taxation for managing and financing the public debt, as well as that of private users of money. Increased rates of interest are responsible for losses running into the billions of dollars.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a member of the Finance Committee, is better versed on this subject than I am. I believe I am correct in saying that the Treasury has exacted from the American taxpayer considerably more than \$1 billion a year in increased interest charges.

Mr. KERR. As of this time, with respect to the \$75 billion or \$80 billion of public debt which has been refinanced, we are now paying more than \$1,250 million a year in excess interest, compared with what was paid on that part of the public debt 5 years ago; and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, admitted that if the Treasury refinances the entire public debt—and, as of this time, the average maturity of the entire debt is less than 4 years—by the time the public debt of \$275 billion has been completely refunded the excess in interest charges on the Federal public debt only, over what it was 5 years ago, will be represented by \$5 billion a year of extra cost, which will have to be met by taxes paid by the public.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish the American people could get that message. I wish it were drilled home to them. When we talk about an additional burden of Government expense, there is no burden of Government expense which is much larger than this, save our defense program. This is a burden which has a way of compounding itself. Once the Government establishes a higher rate on Government bonds, there is a chain reaction throughout the entire economy.

Mr. KERR. In that connection, Mr. Humphrey admitted—

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator means Mr. George Humphrey?

Mr. KERR. Yes. Mr. George Humphrey further admitted that, with respect to the total private debt, corporate and individual, when it is refunded—and it refunds more quickly than the public debt—the increased interest private borrowers will have to pay, over what they were paying 5 years ago, will constitute a penalty on them of \$10 billion a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So we have an aggregate penalty, pursuant to the policies being pursued, of approximately \$15 billion.

Mr. KERR. When our public and private debts have been refunded, the American people will be in the posture of bearing the burden of additional interest cost and tax cost for interest on the public and private debt, of \$15 billion a year. That will constitute the Eisenhower-Humphrey heritage to the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respectfully ask that when that heritage is bequeathed or announced to the American people, it be denominated as the Eisenhower-George Humphrey heritage. Somewhere along the line someone is likely to misunderstand.

I regret that the Senate Finance Committee hearings, in which the Senator from Oklahoma played such an honorable and important role, were not given the same degree of publicity among the American people as that accorded the labor rackets committee hearings. When the total costs are added up, it will be found that the American people will pay more because of the mismanagement of the money and credit policies of our Government than they are paying by reason of hoodlumism or racketeering in some labor or management groups. If we make a real evaluation of the cost to the American people, the mismanagement of money and credit policies, and the interest rate policies of the administration, will exact a much heavier toll from the American people than the 2-bit racketeer who was brought here from New York City. He was a crook in his own right, to be sure; but he would have to work pretty hard to get \$15 billion.

Mr. KERR. The \$15 billion is not the total load, because those fiscal policies, together with the policies in connection with housing and the accelerated depreciation administrative policies, constitute the seed from which has sprung the Eisenhower inflation, by which we now find ourselves surrounded and penalized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish publicly to pay tribute and render thanks to the Senator from Oklahoma for the great job he has performed as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, not only in connection with the regular duties of that committee, but in connection with the all-important hearing and investigation into the monetary and fiscal policies of the administration. I say, with all the sincerity at my command, that it is most unfortunate that much of the material which the Senator from Oklahoma and his colleagues have brought into the official transcript of

the record has not been made available to and has not been headlined before the American people. The American people are still being kept in the dark about the fiscal and monetary policies. That field is supposed to be an exclusive domain, a special hunting lodge, the private estate of a small handful of people. Everyone else is supposed to stay out.

Yet I remind my colleagues today that the people are beginning to look to Congress for some action. I received a letter from the Minnesota School Board Association. There is no more honorable group in my State. I think the same thing can be said of every other State. The school board associations represent the finest of our local government officials. They are not radicals. Most of them are moderates, and conservatives. The members of local school boards are the finest people in the community.

What are they asking for? In my State it is not usual for the people to make appeals for Federal assistance. They are appealing to the Federal Government, the Congress, and the President, to do something about the interest rates, which are placing such an unbearable burden upon our local government institutions. The school-building program in many areas is being crippled, or at least retarded, by the very interest rate and credit policies pursued by the administration.

We are losing one schoolroom after another to the coupon clippers, the bondholders, who do not need the schoolrooms. It is the children of America who need the schoolrooms. We are losing them simply because of the rising cost of money, which must be compensated for, when a school is built, by clipping off an auditorium, cutting off a classroom, eliminating a cafeteria, or doing away with a gymnasium. For what reason? To please an administration which is dedicated to a misguided economic policy.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware, is he not, of the fact that the President sent a request to the governors' conference at Williamsburg, Va., a few weeks ago, calling upon them to devise ways and means so that the State and local governments could take over a larger share of the burden of the overall operation of government, and thereby relieve the Federal Government of a portion of the burden it now carries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am aware of that.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator not aware of the message which the governors sent back?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The governors sent back a message dealing with fiscal and interest rate policies.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that the 45 governors, including 18 Republicans and 17 Democrats, unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the President to take action to alleviate the increasing burden which has been placed upon State and local governments, in the form of higher interest rates, caused by the fiscal policies of this administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is aware of that, and he commends the governors for speaking up in behalf of fiscal sanity in the several States, in terms of the public services which are in need of better financing.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota one more question. In doing so I wish to warn him that he should be very careful and take a lesson from what happened to the Senator from Oklahoma when he attempted to speak on that subject on the floor of the Senate. Does it occur to the Senator that it is entirely possible that the President did not know that his own fiscal policies would be responsible for the fact that it would be impossible for the governors to comply with his request because his own fiscal policies had already made the burden of State and local governments so much greater than it had been in recent years that they were then in the process of considering a resolution to call on the President to amend his fiscal policies so that he could improve the environment so that State and local governments could carry on the obligations they already have and might be in a position to assume a considerable part of those now being carried by the Federal Government?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that time after time we have excused the President on the basis that undoubtedly, as the statement goes, he does not know about this or that, or was not informed of it.

I say most respectfully it is the duty of the President to know about these things. It is the duty of the President to be in charge of the Department of the Treasury through his agent.

When Secretary George Humphrey was in office he said he was carrying out the policies of the Eisenhower administration. I noticed also when Mr. Burgess testified he testified that all he was doing was carrying out the policies of the Eisenhower administration. I believe Mr. Burgess was much more convincing in making the policy than in carrying it out.

I should like to think that I am charitable. I have very seldom been personally unkind to the Chief Executive. I must say that the time has arrived when we can no longer go around excusing President Eisenhower for not knowing about something that is going on. Everytime something goes wrong someone says, "Don't blame the President. He undoubtedly was not informed." I suggest that he can be informed. I suggest that he is required to be informed.

I suggest that he show one-half as much dynamic leadership in some of the other matters confronting the administration, such as the policy on school construction, as he has in asking for another \$500 million in foreign aid funds. That leadership is a bit belated, but it is now being shown. We would be a great deal better off if he showed such leadership. That is not to say that I am in any way resentful of the President's leadership in this matter, because I am not. I commend him for standing up for his foreign aid bill. I commend him for at long last joining the rest of us who have been fighting for it.

However, I submit also that it is getting a bit shopworn to say, "Well, the President, perhaps, did not know about it." If he did not know about it, my most respectful suggestion is that he get on the ball and learn about it. That is something no one else can do except the President.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator not contemplate the possibility that there has been much more of Mr. Burgess' thinking in what the President has said than there has been of the President's thinking in what Mr. Burgess has said?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the Senator from Oklahoma that Mr. Burgess was one of the most persuasive forces in the administration. As someone has said, he is a banker's banker. That is almost as good as being a lawyer's lawyer.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

FULL PROSPERITY FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, there appears a colloquy between the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from Minnesota, in which we discussed a statement or a pamphlet entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture." The pamphlet was published by the Conference on Economic Progress. Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, one of the Nation's foremost economists, and former Chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers, had a leading role in the preparation of that pamphlet.

Mr. Keyserling read the RECORD, and this morning I received a letter from him dealing with the colloquy. Attached to Mr. Keyserling's letter is a statement which had been published by the Conference on Economic Progress on February 9, 1956. The statement is an answer to the misrepresentations about the brochure entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture."

The Senator from Oklahoma may remember that the charge was made that this pamphlet advocated a substantial reduction in the number of family farms, family-farm workers, and family-farm units. Mr. Keyserling has sent me this letter, dated August 19, along with the statement to which I have referred, commenting upon the debate. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 19, 1957.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I noticed and very much appreciated your comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, August 15, in response to a statement by Senator AIKEN that I had advocated the reduction in the number of family-type farm or other policies inimical to such farms. This statement by Senator AIKEN made reference to a study entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture," in

the preparation of which I had a leading role, and which was published on November 27, 1955.

I have always had and still have the highest regard for the integrity and high purposes of Senator AIKEN, and I appreciate the fact that the remarks that he made about me personally were kind. It therefore appears to me that Senator AIKEN has not had the opportunity to examine carefully either my views or the study to which he referred, with reference to the family-type farm. This study, as you know, has as one of its major themes the protection and advancement of the family-type farm, the enlargement of the number of family-type farms, and proposes many practical programs toward this end, although the study of course deals with the general advancement of agriculture to its rightful place in our economy. There are many Senators, I am sure, who have heard me make talks on the farm subject, who know very well that for several years I have been engaged in what might almost be called a crusade for the benefit of agriculture as I see it, including especially the family-type farm.

It may interest you further to know that the origin of the complete misreading of the study *Full Prosperity for Agriculture* was the Department of Agriculture, as might have been suspected, and the Department should have known better. On January 26, 1956, Secretary Benson, in a nationwide television program, originated (so far as I know) this complete misreading of my views and those contained in the study.

I am enclosing for your further information a statement prepared on February 9, 1956, designed to analyze and answer this entirely unjustified criticism by Secretary Benson, which was repeated in many quarters.

If you deem it desirable, I should be glad to have this letter to you, or the enclosed statement, or both, inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, as I think that a number of Senators may be interested in the subject matter.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

LEON H. KEYSERLING,

Consulting Economist and Attorney at Law.

STATEMENT IN ANSWER TO MISREPRESENTATIONS ABOUT FULL PROSPERITY FOR AGRICULTURE

(Study published by Conference on Economic Progress on November 27, 1955)

In Edward R. Murrow's nationwide television program on January 26, Secretary of Agriculture Benson indulged in a completely distorted misreading of a few phrases drawn out of context from *Full Prosperity for Agriculture*, a 118-page study published on November 27, 1955, by the Conference on Economic Progress. Specifically, the Secretary said that this study urged that about 2 million farmers be forced off the land; and he made rather derisive reference to some members of the national committee of the conference, including some distinguished farm leaders and two of the most distinguished leaders of American labor who vigorously favor an improved farm program not only as a matter of simple economic justice but also because industrial workers cannot remain permanently secure if farmers remain in deep trouble. The Secretary's distortions of this study have been widely repeated or paralleled in various parts of the country.

Full Prosperity for Agriculture raises for intelligent public consideration how farm income may be improved, farm production best adjusted to maximum needs for domestic consumption and exports, and the structure of the farm plant reconciled with these other two objectives with due recognition for the value of farm life as a good in itself.

This study points out that, under the 1955 structure of farming, there were about 100,000 very large or giant commercial farms, including some "factories in the field," comprising about 3 percent of the total number of commercial farms, but contributing about 26 percent to total farm sales and receiving at least that percentage of total farm income. The average family income of the owners of these farms may have been as high as \$12,000, with many very much higher. At the other extreme, there were about 1.3 million commercial farms, coming to about 38 percent of the total, but contributing only about 8 percent to total farm sales and receiving perhaps a smaller percentage than this of total farm income. The average family incomes of these farms was about \$1,400, and only \$1,000 of this miserably inadequate average was derived from farming. These terribly depressed farm units are largely in the South, and many of their inhabitants eke out even a substandard livelihood only by part-time nonfarm work. In between these two extremes, there were about 2 million more or less adequate family-type farms, less than 60 percent of the total, and contributing about 64 percent to total farm sales and receiving somewhere in that neighborhood of total farm income. (The final 2 percent of farm sales comes from about 1½ million noncommercial farms.) The incomes of these family-type farm families, along with that of agriculture as a whole, have declined drastically in recent years, so that perhaps more than half of them have annual incomes below \$3,000. But these more or less adequate family-type farms would be the proper model for American agriculture, if their incomes and opportunities could be sufficiently raised.

To bring better balance into this farm structure, the conference study proposes for consideration a series of policies to prevent further dominance by the very large and giant farms; and that by 1960 the number of more or less adequate family-type farms—small, middle-sized, and moderately large—be increased by about half a million, and that their share of total farm sales and income be increased from about 64 percent to at least 70 percent. To enlarge so substantially the number of these family-type farms, the study contemplates that a large number of the miserably poverty-stricken farms, horribly inadequate both as to size and income, be helped to become adequate family-type farms. But it also recognizes that there can be no hopeful solution for many of the people who now derive some income from these poverty-stricken farms (some as owners and some as tenants or workers) unless there are some improved opportunities for movement into industrial work, either full-time or to supplement their farm-derived incomes. Counting both some of those who "own" these terribly substandard units, and some of those who do hired part-time or full-time work on farms but who are not farm owners at all, it is estimated that some movement by some of these people into industrial work by 1960 might result in an overall decrease of about three-fourths million to the number of people engaged in full-time or part-time farm work, and that these with the nonworking members of their families might number approximately 2 million. Many of these people are so utterly depressed that no farm program alone can assure them an American standard of living.

Any long-range adjustment in the farm population along these lines would be much slower than that projected by most other competent studies. Comparing 1955 with 1929, the farm population has declined from more than 30 million to about 22 million, or from about one-fourth to about 13½ percent of the total population. Secretary Benson knows perfectly well that anybody who said there were not going to be any further adjustments in the farm population between

now and 1960 would not know what he was talking about; and the Secretary knows further that President Eisenhower on various occasions has identified improved industrialization and employment opportunity as one significant aspect of bringing a better life and better incomes to the farm population. If Secretary Benson has any proposals whereby all of the 700,000 farm operator families with incomes of less than \$1,000 a year, and all of the 2 million with incomes of less than \$2,000 a year, can be transformed into farm operators of sufficient size and earn enough farm income to enjoy an American standard of living, without overproduction or excessive income-subsidy, he ought to reveal these proposals.

The conference farm pamphlet does not propose to "force" any farmers off the land. But it does state that "masses of underemployed people on the farm, eking out a substandard living, nullify any assertion that the economy as a whole enjoys full employment, production and purchasing power." And it does state that "The process of putting people through the wringer as a means of redistributing our productive resources between farm and nonfarm work is neither efficient from the economic viewpoint nor justifiable from the human viewpoint * * * neither farm nor industrial workers should be rationed and reassigned by the brutal process of unemployment and deflated income. Instead, private and public economic policy * * * should not only be protective to individuals during the transition process, but also should be used to prompt them toward the transition by income inducements rather than income deflation." In short, the study urges an expanding full employment environment in which all who work for a living, everywhere, shall have opportunity to make a genuine election of their work, and to join in parity enjoyment of the American standard of living.

The attitude of the conference farm pamphlet is further illustrated by this language: "Asking industry to absorb the 'surplus labor supply' of agriculture is just as bad as asking the farm economy to absorb the 'surplus labor supply' of industry. The experience of 1954, when some industries advertised to recruit workers from the farm areas at one time of year, and then told them to go back to the farm at another time of year, is no sound guide to future action. * * * This problem should not be approached in the spirit of shifting a farm burden to industry or an industrial burden to agriculture, thus fomenting artificial conflicts between the two groups. * * * A general full employment program for the whole economy is essential equally to the well-being of agriculture and to the well-being of all the people * * * the maintenance of full employment and the full utilization of our productive potential in the overall economy are goals which should unite farmers, workers, and business interests in a mutual and vigorously sustained effort."

Secretary Benson, and others misrepresenting the conference farm study, ignore the high goals and vigorous programs which it sets forth to help lift farm income toward income parity with other groups. The study proposes that total farm income from all sources be lifted in 1956 to about \$3½ billion above the current level. This would mean an increase of more than \$150 in the per capita income of the farm population. The study proposes that the total income of the farm population from all sources be lifted from about \$19 billion in 1955 to about \$29 billion in 1960, which would lift the average per capita income of the farm population from all sources from about \$865 in mid-1953 to about \$1,450 by 1960. Even the higher figure would be only about two-thirds that of the nonfarm population as a whole by 1960 in a full employment environment. The study proposes that the number of farm

operator families with incomes under \$1,000 a year be reduced from 12.5 percent of all farm operator families in 1953 to only 2 percent by 1960; that the number with incomes between \$1,000 and \$2,000 a year be reduced from 24.5 percent to 5 percent; that the number with incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,000 be reduced from 20 percent to 11 percent; and that the number with incomes above \$4,000 be increased from 28.4 percent to 66 percent. The study proposes that the general average income of all farm operator families be brought up to an average of about \$5,400 by 1960, compared with \$3,460 in 1953. The study proposes specific measures to redirect farm income protection, so that most of it would go to the family type farm rather than to the giant farm. What goals has Secretary Benson ever set to move American farm families in this upward direction, and what programs has he ever offered to accomplish this objective?

The conference farm study is unique in the high goals which it sets forth for the improvement of farm income and living standards, in its concentration upon the protection and advancement of the family-type farm, in its insistence that the farmer should receive income parity and not just price parity, and in the range and boldness of the practical programs which it recommends to accomplish these objectives. No contrast could be more vivid than that between this farm pamphlet, and the contrived deflation of farm income and living standards which has been taking place at an accelerating rate during the most recent years.

Secretary Benson's improper and indefensible attack upon the conference farm study has been reiterated widely in various publications; there is some appearance of a unified effort further to confuse the public and to bamboozle the farmer.

The Secretary might well consider abandoning the habit of (a) endorsing unjust attacks upon the American farmer, which he has not read (the Harper's article), or (b) attacking reasonable proposals to help the American farmer, which evidently he has not read. Above all, he might abandon the idea that unjustified slurs upon individuals and groups, designed to inflame prejudice rather than to evoke reason, and to play one group against another when all should work together, can help to get agriculture out of its serious plight.

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

COMPACT FOR APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF LITTLE MISSOURI RIVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1556) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and for related purposes, which was, on page 4, strike out lines 4 and 5, inclusive, and insert:

Sec. 3. The authority granted in this act shall expire 4 years from the date of enactment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, S. 1556 relates to a compact among the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming regarding the waters of the Little Missouri River.

I move the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The first amendment strikes section 3 of the bill as unnecessary since the right

of Congress to alter, amend or repeal an act is recognized by the Constitution.

The second amendment inserts a new section 3 that says the authority granted in this act to negotiate the compact shall expire in 4 years.

I have cleared the matter with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

LENDING AUTHORITY OF REA

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I present a resolution passed by the Morgan County Rural Electric Association on August 9, 1957, in Fort Morgan, Colo.

This resolution is an expression of confidence in David Hamil, the REA Administrator, and asks that his administration "be continued without interruption or change." Mr. Hamil is a native of Colorado.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MORGAN COUNTY RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, FRIDAY, AUGUST 9, 1957

It was moved by W. F. Tormohlen, seconded by H. W. Bigler that the following resolution be adopted:

"That certain publicity has recently been given to the fact that the Administrator of REA, the Honorable David Hamil, may, in the near future, be replaced; and

"Whereas, it is the opinion of the Morgan County REA and the board of directors thereof that the said David Hamil has performed outstanding service to REA during his administration and that he has faithfully, honestly, fearlessly, and impartially carried out his duties in accordance with the purposes and objectives of rural electrifications: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this association make public records of the commendation of David Hamil for his fine and selfless service to our cause and that his administration be continued without interruption or change; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Senators and Congressmen from Colorado, so that they may be aware of the esteem of this association for the Honorable David Hamil."

Adopted and approved this 9th day of August 1957. Motion carried.

C. C. DAILY,
President.

Attest:

GEORGE T. WHITE,
Secretary.

Several days ago the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota expressed himself on the subject of the administration of the Rural Electric Administration. He said he had asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to come before his subcommittee. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether Secretary Benson has come before his subcommittee with reference to the case of REA Administrator Mr. David Hamil, and his authority to approve certain REA loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reply to the Senator from Colorado without his losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado has asked whether we have obtained an agreement from the Secretary of Agriculture to testify before the subcommittee on reorganization relating to the reorganization program of the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture. This issue goes to the lending authority of REA.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota speak louder?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Members will refrain from audible conversation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Colorado that it had been brought to my attention that the Rural Electrification Administration and the administrator, Mr. Hamil, were being supervised by the Secretary of Agriculture on large loans, over \$500,000, for generating facilities, to such a point that before any such loan was granted it had to have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

That is the allegation. I do not know whether it is true. I want the RECORD to be quite clear on that.

It has been alleged in the official publication of the National Rural Electrification Association magazine. I therefore asked the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which committee is handling all the reorganization reports relating to the departments of government, to inquire of the Department of Agriculture when we could have Mr. Benson appear before the subcommittee on reorganization.

The request was made of Mr. Benson because at that time the reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture was considered in Congress and reviewed by the subcommittee on reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Benson assured the subcommittee members, not once, not twice, but three times, that the reorganization plan of the Department of Agriculture would in no way whatever, in any detail, form, or manner, touch the Rural Electrification Administration. He went further. He said that the lending authority would in no way be jeopardized with or altered or even touched in any way.

I do not know whether it has been touched or altered. I do know that charges have been made. I asked the committee staff of the Committee on Government Operations—of which committee the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is the chairman—to pursue with the Department of Agriculture the possibility of getting Mr. Benson to testify.

I must report again most regretfully that for days we were unable to get in touch with the Secretary. As everyone knows, the Secretary was absent from the capital for 50 days. It took Jules Verne 80 days to go around the world, and it has taken Mr. Benson 50 days to get out of the woods. He came back after 50 days. During that time I was unable to get any word whatever from the

Department except that they were unable to get in touch with the Secretary.

The Secretary returned to Washington on Thursday of last week, I believe. The staff director of the reorganization subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations consulted with officials of the Department of Agriculture and with Mr. Merriam, the Secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture; but all to no avail. Finally the chief counsel of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Farrington, informed the Subcommittee on Reorganization that Mr. Benson would not be available to testify before any Congressional committee during the remainder of this session of Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So I think the Members of the Senate should know that for all practical purposes a Cabinet officer has told a responsible Congressional committee that he will not appear to testify, even though allegations which have been made require his personal appearance. His staff have told me they would come. I am not going to be bullheaded about the matter; but since the Secretary of Agriculture is responsible, I think he should appear. He will be treated respectfully. We were not looking for a fight. We were looking for information.

The Senator from Minnesota—because he has frequently opposed the Secretary of Agriculture—did not initiate the calls directly. The Senator from Minnesota had a staff member—one who has been on the staff since 1946, under both political parties—handle the entire matter. That staff member came to me on Friday and told me that the legal counsel for the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Farrington—a very respectable and fine gentleman—notified the committee that not only would Mr. Benson not agree to a date, but that he would not appear to testify before a Congressional committee.

I do not know whether a Cabinet officer can be subpoenaed; but if he can, this man surely deserves to be subpoenaed; and I am going to look into the matter.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota that there is every justification for having his subcommittee make an investigation of this sort. That is why I am submitting certain material for the Record today. One of the articles I now hold has originated since our last colloquy on the floor of the Senate regarding this matter, which arose—as the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota knows—without any previous plan, design, or preparation. When the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota spoke at that time, I did not know that he was really speaking about David Hamil, who comes from Colorado.

Since our colloquy, I have read several articles published in Colorado newspapers. For instance, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Hamil's Authority Over REA Now Subjected to Review." The article was written by Gene Wortsman, Rocky Mountain News Washington correspondent. I desire to point out

that the Rocky Mountain News is a Scripps-Howard publication, not a Democratic publication. Mr. Wortsman telephoned the REA, and as a result of his phone call, he wrote the article I am holding.

The article indicates the very situation to which the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has referred, namely, that, in violation of Mr. Benson's agreement, there has been a limitation on the loan authority of the REA Administrator.

Of equal significance is an article from the Denver Post, an independent Republican newspaper, which supported the Eisenhower administration. The Denver Post headlines an editorial of August 14, 1957—following our colloquy, and following the request by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota to the Secretary of Agriculture to come before his subcommittee—"Why Make Dave Hamil the Goat?"

The Denver Post editorial, after a preface of 5 or 6 paragraphs, outlining the background of the REA and the importance of REA loans, states:

Now, all of this bears upon the reported difficulties of Colorado's David Hamil—

Mr. President, let me say for the Record that David Hamil is a Republican; he has been known for a generation to be a Republican. So we are not talking about partisan politics. David Hamil was a former Republican speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives.

I shall read the whole sentence in the editorial:

Now, all of this bears upon the reported difficulties of Colorado's David Hamil, who for the last year has been Administrator for the REA in Washington. The Administrator is now expected to submit all applications for loans of more than \$500,000 to higher authority in the Department of Agriculture for review. We can only guess why.

Mr. President, the next statement in the editorial indicates why the investigation is important; and the paragraph of the editorial which I am about to read is one of the most important paragraphs to be found in it:

The conflicts that are multiplying between private power companies and rural electric cooperatives have been carried into the upper strata of politics. The Administrator who adheres to the guidelines of the REA Act, who processes loan applications by long-accepted standards of economic feasibility, and who ignores the protests of private power companies whose service areas are beginning to commingle or overlap with those of the REA, invites political repercussions. That, we suggest, happened to Mr. Hamil.

I say it is a curious coincidence that at the very time when the editorial was written in Denver, David Hamil was in Colorado.

I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota for wishing to find out about this matter. I ask these questions: Is it true that the lending authority of David Hamil has been curbed since June? If it is true, why was it not subject to review prior to June? What occurred to bring about this new limitation of Mr. Hamil's authority? The article in the REA Association magazine about the REA, to which the distin-

guished Senator from Minnesota referred, leaves a clear implication, I think, that there is something rotten in Denmark. There may not be; but here we find two Colorado newspapers probing into the matter; and the indication in the Denver Post editorial "That, we suggest, happened to Mr. Hamil."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Rocky Mountain News article and the Denver Post editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News of August 13, 1957]

HAMIL'S AUTHORITY OVER REA NOW SUBJECTED TO REVIEW

(By Gene Wortsman)

WASHINGTON, August 12.—REA Administrator David A. Hamil refers all loan applications over \$500,000 to higher authority for policy suggestions, the News was told Monday.

Hamil's superior, Director K. L. Scott, of the Agricultural Credit Service, admitted this procedure has been in effect since the first week in June.

However, he denied that authority to approve or disapprove the applications has been taken from Hamil.

EXTRA STEP

He called it an additional step rather than an added restriction.

The question obviously is a touchy one in the Department.

Hamil, of Atwood, Colo., is out of town for the rest of August. The Acting REA Administrator, J. K. O'Shaughnessy, was skittish. He shied from a direct answer when asked how he handles applications over \$500,000.

"Just a minute," he said.

In a moment, he replied, "We've had a number of loans to come up. This thing is now in the Senate. The hearing is to be scheduled with the Secretary (of Agriculture) to appear. I don't think any comment now would be appropriate."

HEARING SOUGHT

O'Shaughnessy had reference to a hearing which Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, of Minnesota), has been trying to set before his Agriculture Subcommittee.

HUMPHREY said he has attempted to get Secretary Ezra Taft Benson to testify but the Secretary won't set a date for his appearance.

HUMPHREY said he wants to find out if it's true that Hamil no longer can handle applications for loans over \$500,000.

The report was that these loans go to former Congressman Wesley D'Ewart, an assistant to Scott.

I called D'Ewart, Monday, and asked for his comment on the matter.

D'Ewart said: "Just a minute, please."

SUBSTITUTE SPEAKER

In a moment, he was back on the telephone.

"I've asked Mr. Scott, the head of this department, to speak to you," he said.

Scott said the report that Hamil's authority had been taken away is quite an exaggeration of what's actually happened.

"Under delegation of authority," he said, "the Secretary asked me to work with the REA and the other agencies. Dave Hamil and I talked a number of times about the situation that he finds himself in."

Scott explained the situation is that REA is growing as are applications for loans and amounts.

Also, there is an economy drive on and money loaned from the United States Treasury is being held to absolute needs.

"I told Hamil if he wanted to send over to me applications for loans over \$500,000 I'd be glad to look at them," Scott declared.

NO CHANGE

This would be another means of keeping himself advised, Scott added.

"Dave well understands there's been no change in his authority to approve loans," he said.

Nor has there been a delegation of Hamil's authority, said Scott.

The Director said he looks at the applications if he has time. Otherwise, D'Ewart or Harry Thomas, a staff member, looks at them and talks to him about them.

If a policy matter is involved, Scott discusses it with Hamil on a suggestion basis.

"Hamil takes them and does with them as he thinks he should," the director said.

Scott was asked if Hamil, if he desired, could stop sending the applications to Scott.

HELPFUL DESIGN

"He could," Scott agreed. "I have supervision over him. I'm acting for the Secretary. Dave's not going to do that * * * if he said he's just going to drop it, I'd be surprised. It's designed to be 100 percent helpful."

After Scott's explanation, I told him it still looked as though Hamil couldn't act independently.

"Oh, no," Scott replied. "I just review them. After the review, this is the important thing, if I see a point I think is important policywise, all I do is suggest it to Dave. I tell him if it was me I would inquire into that."

In addition to this splitting of Hamil's authority, there have been reports that he would be fired after Congress leaves.

The reason attributed is that Hamil has been too friendly to cooperatives and this has distressed private power companies.

Scott said he knew nothing about any plans to fire Hamil.

[From the Denver Post of August 14, 1957]

WHY MAKE DAVE HAMIL THE GOAT?

The Rural Electrification Act, which has spread the benefits of electricity to farms and very small towns all over the United States, was not written in anticipation of the physical and technological changes that have taken place in the last two decades.

The REA was created to energize rural America. It was conceived to do something the private power companies felt they could not do—extend electric-light and power service deeply into low-load-factor areas with low-interest, long-repayment, and nonprofit cooperative loans.

The REA has succeeded to the extent of electrifying almost 95 percent of the country's farms and rural homes. And in recent years the demands upon the REA's have changed, giving rise to awkward policy problems.

Today the rural electric cooperatives are interested more in loans to strengthen their power-carrying capacity or expand their power supplies than in loans for original construction. Why? Because residential, agricultural, and industrial customers served by the REA's want more and more power. And this is where, under the REA Act as it stands, the trouble starts.

The private power companies in many instances now feel warranted in going after and serving heavier and profitable power loads than either (1) have been served by REA's hitherto or (2) are in territory that in the past would be considered the REA's to claim.

Thus, when REA's now apply for loans to "heavy up" their lines or to build generation and transmission systems, those applications are exposed to more frequent challenge by private power companies which insist the loans are unnecessary.

The REA's reply that the law exists for their use; that participating co-op members

would benefit (both in repayment of old loans and in lower future rates) from a greater volume of kilowatt sales; that the private power companies are thwarting the intent of Congress which passed the law when they stifle the grant of loans by political interference.

Now, all of this bears upon the reported difficulties of Colorado's David Hamil, who for the last year has been Administrator for the REA in Washington. The Administrator is now expected to submit all applications for loans of more than \$500,000 to higher authority in the Department of Agriculture for review. We can only guess why.

The conflicts that are multiplying between private power companies and rural electric cooperatives have been carried into the upper strata of politics. The Administrator, who adheres to the guidelines of the REA Act, who processes loan applications by long-accepted standards of economic feasibility, and who ignores the protests of private power companies whose service areas are beginning to commingle or overlap with those of the REA, invites political repercussions. That, we suggest, happened to Mr. Hamil.

Perhaps the REA Act needs amendment to reflect the changing physical and economic circumstances in widespread areas of public versus private power competition. On the other hand there is no good reason why any electric cooperative should be handicapped or crippled as a result of competitive invasion by a private utility determined to cash in on a market originally developed with the public's money.

The point is, such foregoing questions can be answered by Congress in the kind of REA law it makes, and not by administrative policy which exposes the REA Act to the whim or the whip of politicians and the lobbies of special interests that may or may not be effective at any given time. Mr. Hamil and indeed no Administrator of the REA should be expected to distort the law by executive decision simply because the law is inadequate to the stresses modern problems impose on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the Rural Electrification Administration is an autonomous agency for administrative purposes within the Department of Agriculture. The REA Administrator is appointed for a 10-year term, therefore, so that his term will overlap the presidential term. The REA Administrator is supposed to be removed from the overall policy supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. The REA is set up as an independent, autonomous agency.

I repeat that the record is absolutely clear that the Secretary of Agriculture said, when he was before the Subcommittee on Reorganization, that in no way whatsoever—not in any form, manner, shape, or token—would there be any interference with the loan policy or the administration of Rural Electrification Administration.

I hold in my hand the article published on August 13 in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo.—or, rather, a clipping from that article, which was sent to me from Colorado because of the interest which had been exhibited in Mr. Hamil and in the REA. Toward the end of the article, I notice the following:

In addition to this splitting of Hamil's authority, there have been reports that he would be fired after Congress leaves.

The reason attributed is that Hamil has been too friendly to cooperatives and this has distressed private power companies.

Mr. President, I believe I was the only Senator who examined Mr. Hamil over a considerable period of time, when he was appointed to succeed Mr. Anchor Nelson as the REA Administrator. I recall asking Mr. Hamil to come before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I shall not say I was the only Senator who questioned him; but I spent a great deal of time examining Mr. Hamil, questioning him about his record, and going into his background, and receiving from him policy statements regarding how he believed the REA should be administered.

I wish to commend Mr. Hamil for his integrity and for sticking to what he said he was going to do. I commend him for his diligence. I commend him for his nonpartisanship in handling that office.

I say this is the first time since REA has been established that it has been the subject of political controversy, insofar as management in the Department of Agriculture has been concerned. The only way this matter can be settled is by having the Secretary of Agriculture come before the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CARROLL. First, Mr. President, I should like to commend the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for his remarks.

Let me say that I have heard no concrete evidence that Mr. Hamil is going to be discharged from his position, although I think there is some hearsay to that effect.

But I think evidence exists that his lending authority has been interfered with. The article I have inserted in the RECORD—the one published in the Rocky Mountain News—indicates that the authority to approve loans over \$500,000 now has been transferred to the Agricultural Credit Service Director, Kenneth Scott; and that if Mr. Scott is not there to exercise it, it will be exercised by a former Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Wesley D'Ewart.

I have no further information about this matter than that which I have read in several newspaper articles and editorials. They have been written by reputable reporters and journalists of distinction.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to yield to my senior colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for a question.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. CARROLL. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota, if the Senator from Colorado will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The position taken by Mr. Benson is surprising, alarming, and arrogant, it seems to me—namely,

that he will not testify about this important matter or any other matter which may come up, during the remainder of the present session of Congress. There may develop several important agricultural problems regarding which the House of Representatives or the Senate may need testimony from Mr. Benson before the end of this session.

Does Mr. Benson state any reason or excuse for acting in such an arrogant, unthoughtful, and uncooperative way?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only reply to the Senator from Tennessee that every effort which has been made to get in touch with Mr. Benson has failed; that the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, speaks for Mr. Benson; and that the Department of Agriculture has said that Mr. Morse would be happy to testify. But Mr. Morse is not the one who testified when we had the reorganization plan under consideration in the committee. Mr. Farrington is the legal counsel for the Department of Agriculture, and Mr. Farrington has said to the staff director of the Committee on Government Operations that Mr. Benson was not going to appear and would not appear on any matter relating to agriculture or to his Department during the remainder of this session of Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was trying to recall, but I cannot, any time in our contemporary history when a Cabinet member has defied Congress in such a way. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota can recall such an instance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I cannot recall one, and I cannot recall when a Cabinet member has been away from his Department for such a long period of time when there were vital matters relating to the Department's business before Congress. Of course, it can always be said that the Secretary can rely on his Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary. Those men have been available. They are available now. I felt, in view of the fact that the Secretary had personally appeared and assured the full Committee on Government Operations that in the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture nothing would be done to REA, the least he would do would be to come back and permit us to inquire as to the charges. I repeat, I do not know whether the charges are true at all. I think the only one who can set us straight is the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If Senators are interested in getting the Secretary of Agriculture to appear, while I am pretty sure he means it when he says he will not appear, there is one committee before which he will appear, and that is the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. He always appears before that subcommittee.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to make perfectly clear the reason why, in my opinion, this matter becomes important. The important question is whether lending authority has been taken away, not only from David Hamil, who is the person immediately concerned, but from any

REA Administrator because of a conflict between REA and the private power companies. If there has been a breach of an agreement, as mentioned by the junior Senator from Minnesota, of what was agreed to some time ago when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the committee, even that is not of the greatest importance. The important question is, as I see it, "Why are they curbing the REA Administrator's lending authority?" It is alleged that it began in June. Did it exist before then? If not, what brought on the new policy? We ought to quickly get to the bottom of this matter and find out first of all whether the charges being made are true, and if they are true, that is, if Mr. Scott and Mr. D'Ewart are limiting the authority of the REA Administrator, we ought to find out why.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have listened to the colloquy on the floor for the last 10 minutes on this matter. I am happy to see the junior Senator from Minnesota present, as well as the junior Senator from Colorado, because I want them both to hear what I have to say. I suppose we can resort to Government by newspaper, but newspapermen report what they hear, and they are entitled to place upon it the interpretations to which they think it is susceptible. I know Mr. Wortsman to be an honest and capable man, but I do not know what the background of either of these gentlemen is with respect to the investigation of this matter. I can say that I have personally gone to great effort to investigate what the facts are, and I am not depending upon any newspaper or any column. I believe Senators will find that the authority of Dave Hamil to make loans in the REA is unimpaired and that, as Administrator of the REA, his authority to make loans has never been tampered with and, although the loan files have been reviewed by the Department of Agriculture, he has had it made clear to him, again and again, that he is the sole judge and has the sole power placed in him by the Congress to pass upon loans made to the individual REA's.

I am personally very proud of the record Dave Hamil has made, and I am glad to see my friends on the other side of the aisle paying tribute in this instance to a great Republican. Dave Hamil was speaker of the House of Representatives in the State of Colorado for, I believe, five terms, which would be 10 years, and resigned that position only to accept his present position. His background for it, as I am sure the junior Senator from Minnesota well remembers from his examination of him, lies in his early years as a farm boy, later as a graduate of Hastings College, then as a successful farmer and cattle raiser, and as one of the original organizers and directors of one of the first REA's in Colorado. His interest in this field has never lagged.

I do not know what the reasons are, and I would listen to the Secretary of Agriculture as to why he is not available to the committee. That is not the point to which I wish to speak. I do want to say that, regardless of what the

newspapers have to say about it or what any columnist may have to say about it, regardless of what extraneous issue may be interjected, regardless of the fact that the public power interests do want to make this issue a battleground and are not worried about whether the good administration of the REA suffers in doing so, regardless of all this, Dave Hamil will stay as REA Administrator if he so desires. The only time he will leave is if he himself, of his own volition, without any extraneous and outside pressure, and because of his own personal desires, decides to leave, and only then. Moreover, so long as he remains Administrator, I am assured that he will retain the full authority that the office has always had.

While I have the floor and am on the subject, I wish to add one comment. We in Colorado have had some very, very hard problems to solve. That is true not only in Colorado; it is true in many other States. There are many issues to be resolved. From what I have seen, I am personally happy with the progress REA has made under the directorship of Dave Hamil.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I may say to the Senator from Colorado I appreciate his comments, and I assure him that nothing I have said since the first day I met Mr. Hamil, and had an opportunity to visit with him for 2 or 3 hours in the committee room, has been in any way uncomplimentary to him. I am not viewing him as a Democrat or a Republican, because I assume that when he assumed his duties as Administrator he left his politics outside the job. That is the way it is supposed to be.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from Minnesota knew him as I know him, he would know that when Dave Hamil took his oath of office he would live up to it in the finest sense of the word.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that is so. I have said I do not know whether these charges are true or not. I would hope that they are not. I have yet to receive any information from official channels to the contrary. All that was asked was that in light of the assurances given to us by the Secretary, he would come back and answer the charges that had been made in public and in official or semiofficial publications. No one was going to give him a hard time. Frankly, I do not want to have any long committee sessions. What I want to do more than anything else is to finish the business of Congress and go home. I have no desire to have another subcommittee on reorganization meeting. However, I must say it comes a little bit hard to have a Cabinet officer literally refuse to cooperate, and he has refused to cooperate.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know what that situation is. I can imagine good and valid reasons which even the Senator from Minnesota would recognize why the Secretary would not appear at a given time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at a given time. I said, "Pick your time," even to the point of staying here.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not going to be diverted to that subject. I want to stay on the topic and say that there is no attempt by the administration to get Dave Hamil out of the position he now occupies. This can be ascertained by talking to the Department of Agriculture officials and to others in the administration.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I had promised to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to say that REA organizations all over the State of North Dakota have written to me and asked me to intercede with the President to have Dave Hamil kept on his job. He is very popular with REA's all over my State. I wrote to the President some time ago, asking that Mr. Hamil be retained. I have heard these rumors and stories. I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Colorado that in all the history of the REA I do not know of any Administrator who has had better backing from the REA's in North Dakota than has David Hamil, and we have had some very good men.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Hamil myself.

I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota, to finish our colloquy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I simply want to make the record clear. We are not discussing Mr. Hamil. Mr. Hamil's record will stand on its own. What we are discussing is whether under the reorganization plan, under the authority of the Department of Agriculture, and under the authorization for the REA, any loan should be referred to a Department of Agriculture Assistant Secretary or official above the REA Administrator. I think the Senator will be hard put to it to find in the REA Act any authority whatsoever for anyone outside of the REA reviewing an REA loan.

Why do they do it? It may be because they are friendly. It may be because they are "kissin' cousins," or something like that. I do not know. There is no reason at all for the review to be made.

The answer which has been given is the answer not only in the newspaper story, but also in a letter which I have received. It is that the whole matter of reviewing loans comes about because of inflation and because of credit policies, and so forth.

The Congress of the United States determines what the REA loan policy shall be—not Mr. D'Ewart or Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott's position in the Department of Agriculture is Director of the Agricultural Credit Service. He admitted that the procedure of reviewing loans over \$500,000 had been in effect since June.

I say categorically that there is no authorization for that procedure in law. I say at best this is nothing more nor less than an accommodation in the Department. Perhaps there is nothing dangerous about it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say to the Senator that I am not sure the statement can be made categorically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It can.

Mr. ALLOTT. I repeat that there has never been any impairment in any de-

gree of Mr. Hamil's right and authority to make these decisions, with the full power which is given to him in law as the director of the REA. I think when the Senator goes into the matter, if he investigates it, he will find that is a true statement.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me finish my colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say that there will be much less danger of impairment after a debate such as this on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. That statement, perhaps, is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We may have solved the problem by alerting the people.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know this is not any attack in any sense upon Mr. Hamil.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. It is an effort to support him.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know we all have the same interest in achieving a strong REA. I can assure the Senator that Mr. Hamil's power and duties have not been impaired in the least.

I now yield to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I wonder if the Senator from Colorado has found in his investigation what is the basis for the stories being circulated? The essence of the stories we are reading is that in June the lending authority of the REA administrator, David Hamil, was limited to loans of less than \$500,000. That would mean that prior to June he had full lending power and now his power has been limited. This is the question posed by these articles. I believe that is the important question before us.

We have listened to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who has heard rumors to this effect. Those rumors have been circulating in the newspapers in my home State of Colorado.

We have discussed the two fine Colorado newspaper reports. One written by a distinguished Washington reporter, who has no personal interest in the matter. Certainly this reporter is not trying to fan the flames of a contest between public and private power advocates to interfere with the present administration of the act. Then we also have for consideration the views of the very competent editorial staff of the Denver Post, which staff certainly writes its articles only after a careful investigation is conducted.

Does the Senator from Colorado have any specific evidence as to what has started these stories?

Mr. ALLOTT. I think if the Senator would call the Department of Agriculture or would talk with either of these two officials he would find that there is no basis for these articles and that his question can be answered categorically, "No; Mr. Hamil's powers have not been limited."

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to have that information. I shall not dispute the Senator's word. However, my information is to the contrary.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire from where the Senator got his information, aside from the newspaper articles?

Mr. CARROLL. We have information from officials of the Department of Agriculture, who indulged in a lot of double-talk.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us get the names in the open on the floor, so that we can stop this doubletalk and stop the damage to the REA.

Mr. CARROLL. There is one way to do it and that is for the Secretary of Agriculture to appear, to respond, and to state what the situation is.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say that I have talked with numerous people about this subject.

Mr. CARROLL. The way to settle the matter is by a proper investigation. It should not be a newspaper investigation. It should be a Senate committee investigation and the men involved should be brought before the committee so that they can answer the questions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my own side of this matter by saying that I am sure most of us on the floor have a very keen and sincere desire to see the REA continue and to see it develop as it was meant to develop and has a right to develop.

I say again that I am proud of the record Mr. Hamil has made. More than that, I wish to repeat that—newspaper articles to the contrary—his authority has not been impaired as to the making of loans, and he has the full power of the directorship of the REA.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1482) to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. SISK, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DURHAM, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. VAN ZANDT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 7383. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of

the Senate to the following joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House:

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6080) to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States in Gulfport, Miss., to the Gulfport Municipal Separate School District, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the pending order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending order of business is the appropriation bill. The committee amendments have been agreed to en bloc, and one amendment offered on behalf of the committee by the Senator from Arizona has been agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope we can discuss the pending business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I desire to discuss the bill presently before the Senate.

Mr. President, I commend the Senate Committee on Appropriations for placing funds in the bill to permit the Advisory Committee on Weather Control to complete its report to the President.

IRVING LANGMUIR

In that connection, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the comment made by the press services in their report on the death of Irving Langmuir last Friday.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a clipping from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Saturday, in which, in a comment upon the death of this famed research scientist, the writer says:

Mr. Langmuir and another GE scientist, Vincent Schaefer, worked at the close of the war to produce the first manmade rain and snow.

With Schaefer, Mr. Langmuir developed a new technique for producing huge quantities of extremely dense screen smoke which proved highly effective in concealing tactical movements of troops in combat in World War II.

After the war, Mr. Langmuir, with Schaefer and Bernard Vonnegut, produced the first manmade snow and rain.

The importance of the discovery was recognized by the Armed Forces, which estab-

lished Project Cirrus and hired Mr. Langmuir as a consultant.

FULL TIME TO RAIN

By the simple process of seeding clouds with dry ice particles, Langmuir was able to make it rain, provided weather conditions were favorable.

He resigned from the board of trustees of New York's State University to devote full time to Project Cirrus. At the time, he said the project had grown to such great importance that "the best service I can render to the national welfare is to increase, rather than decrease, my activities in this field."

Mr. President, I feel that the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in recognizing the importance of this work, is carrying on in keeping with what Dr. Langmuir himself said:

The best service I can render to the national welfare is to increase, rather than decrease, my activities in this field.

Mr. President, I should also like to state that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has made a valuable contribution, because his committee recently reported, by a unanimous vote, and I think the cosponsorship of all members, S. 86, a bill which would provide for a continuation of selected experimental work by the National Science Foundation, when the advisory committee has completed its report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article on the life of Dr. Langmuir may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOBEL WINNER LANGMUIR DIES

SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK, August 16.—Irving Langmuir, famed research scientist and 1932 Noble prizewinner, died of a heart attack at Falmouth, Mass., the General Electric Co., announced here today.

Mr. Langmuir was 76. He retired from General Electric Co. in 1950 after an association that spread over 40 years. During his work he earned more than 100 patents and was noted chiefly for his postwar research into artificial rainmaking.

Mr. Langmuir and another GE scientist, Vincent Schaefer, worked at the close of the war to produce the first manmade rain and snow.

His research in developing the gas-filled incandescent lamp was credited with cutting \$1 billion from the yearly electric light bills of Americans.

PRODUCED POWER TUBE

His high-vacuum power tube, which permitted use of high voltage in radio sending and receiving, gave modern broadcasting its heart and was regarded as probably the greatest single factor in bringing radios into most American homes.

With Schaefer, Mr. Langmuir developed a new technique for producing huge quantities of extremely dense screen smoke which proved highly effective in concealing tactical movements of troops in combat in World War II.

After the war, Mr. Langmuir, with Schaefer and Bernard Vonnegut, produced the first manmade snow and rain.

The importance of the discovery was recognized by the Armed Forces, which established Project Cirrus and hired Mr. Langmuir as a consultant.

FULL TIME TO RAIN

By the simple process of seeding clouds with dry ice particles, Langmuir was able to make it rain, provided weather conditions were favorable.

He resigned from the board of trustees of New York's State University to devote full time to Project Cirrus. At the time, he said the project had grown to such great importance that "the best service I can render to the national welfare is to increase, rather than decrease, my activities in this field."

Mr. Langmuir was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., January 31, 1881. He attended Chestnut Hill Academy, Philadelphia; Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, and received a metallurgical engineering degree from Columbia University in 1903.

He received his master's and doctor's degree from the University of Göttingen in Germany in 1906. He spent 3 years as a chemistry instructor, at Stevens Institute of Technology before joining the General Electric research staff in 1909.

His 40 years with GE brought him worldwide fame and fortune. He was honored by Great Britain, Italy, Sweden, and France and received many medals and awards from American organizations for his genius in research. He held honorary degrees from 10 American and Canadian universities and from Oxford and Edinburgh in Great Britain.

King Gustav V of Sweden presented the 1932 Nobel prize for his researches in the new-found surface chemistry. He was the first American industrial chemist so honored.

Mr. Langmuir married the former Marian Mersereau of South Orange, N. J., in 1912. They had two children, Kenneth and Mrs. H. R. Summerhayes, Jr.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise regretfully in opposition to the Senate committee amendment to strike from the bill the funds voted by the House of Representatives, amounting to \$12.5 million, for the beginning of construction of a second airport for Washington, D. C. In accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, and the House of Representatives, it is vital that construction work start at the earliest possible time on a second Washington airport.

The rapid increase in "near misses" at the National Airport, the overcongestion and the jamming of the airways into and out of Washington National Airport, have created a critical situation which is overtaxing and overloading the personnel and electronics gear of the airways into and out of Washington National Airport.

It seems to me we have paid too much attention to the political side of a Washington second airport, and too little to the need from an aeronautical standpoint. We have been told for the past 7 years, that the question must be investigated, and the subject studied further.

I well remember when the Congress authorized the second construction of a second Washington airport, in September 1950. In 1951, we appropriated the first money. That money, about \$1 million, was spent to acquire some land at the Burke Airport site.

When the bill was reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was chairman, it did not provide for a political selection of an airport site. It directed the Secretary of Commerce, whose Department supervises the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to investigate, study, and locate the best possible site from an engineering and aviation standpoint, to give Washington a much-needed second air terminal. It was badly needed in 1950. Think how it is needed today.

We have seen the growth year by year, exceed anything we dreamed could possibly have occurred.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. If the need is so urgent as the Senator says it is, does he not think the CAB or some other governmental agency having authority, should direct flights into nearby Friendship Airport, as of this time?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has repeatedly urged the use of Friendship Airport, as the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland well knows. Immediately after the postponement of action last summer on the Burke Airport, or any other airport for Washington, I went to the CAB, I issued press releases, and urged in every way possible that the CAB authorize additional schedules to Friendship Airport, for the duration of the time of construction of a second Washington airport. I feel that by the time an airport can be built, with all possible speed, if additional schedules are placed into Friendship Airport at Baltimore, by 1960 or 1961, we shall have reached complete and total saturation of the airspace above Friendship, and of the runways which are available there.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Maryland would like very much to agree with the statement just made by the Senator from Oklahoma, but I do not think the facts will bear him out. If the Senator will look at the air traffic curve, he will find that Friendship is not anywhere near the point of saturation, and we are now within 2½ years of 1960. There does not seem to be any desire on the part of the airlines now using the very congested airport in Washington to make use of the fine facility which lies nearby in Maryland waiting to be used.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is a facility at Friendship, but there are no schedules. The people of Baltimore would be as eager to fly, I am sure, as the people of other metropolitan areas, if schedules were available. I believe that a vast amount of traffic could be generated. People are eager to fly when air schedules are available.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me point out to the Senator why air schedules are not available now at Friendship Airport. If anyone in Baltimore wishes to fly and he calls the airport, he cannot even find out when there is a connecting plane between Baltimore and Washington. The airlines have done everything they could to keep the traffic at Friendship International Airport at a minimum. They have not cooperated in any way. Even though the Senator from Oklahoma has requested the CAB to bring pressure on the airlines to use Friendship Airport, and although I have done so—and I know that the Senators from Virginia would be more than willing that that should be done—year after year we find the airlines doing everything they can to run Friendship International Airport down, and not put a single flight into it.

When the main airstrip at National Airport in Washington was out of commission and had to be repaired, the CAB,

of necessity, was forced to put the flights into Friendship International Airport. As the testimony before the committee will show, during that period of time service there was excellent. The ground time from Friendship International Airport to the Statler Hotel in Washington was an average of from 40 to 45 minutes; and the best time from Friendship International Airport to the Statler Hotel was 36 minutes. That is all official information gathered by the CAB and given to the Senator from Maryland.

If that be true, how can the Senator from Oklahoma possibly ask the Congress to appropriate \$12,500,000, which we all know would be only the beginning of an expenditure of from \$75 million to \$100 million, to give the city of Washington what it already has in Maryland? I should like to have the Senator address himself to that point. How can he possibly justify the erection of another airport, at Burke, Va., or at any other place in Virginia, against the opposition of the two fine Senators from that State, who say that the people of Virginia do not want that airport there; that it would blight the whole county in which it might be put? The blast from the jet planes would become more noisome and objectionable all the time.

When there is a facility available within from 36 to 45 minutes from the Statler Hotel in Washington, what justification is there for putting this appropriation back in the bill?

SCHEDULE INCREASE TRAFFIC

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator asked that question.

In the first place, I remember distinctly that no one consulted the city of Washington or the needs of the city of Washington when the airport at Friendship was built. We were not asked whether Washington would find it acceptable to use jointly the Baltimore airport. Baltimore put up the money and built the airport. It is the airport of Baltimore.

I have repeatedly said that if there is sufficient capacity there—and I believe there is—for the 3 or 3½ years involved in construction of a second airport for Washington the schedules should be placed into the Baltimore airport. I believe that if such schedules were placed into Friendship Airport, the people of Baltimore, who would use the schedules, would use the full capacity before the opening of the second Washington airport.

CAPITAL NOT COUNTY SEAT

I envision an airport for Washington, whether it be the first or the second, as an airport for the Nation's Capital, the Capital of the largest and most important Nation in the world, and having the greatest volume of air traffic. We should not deal with the question of the location of an airport for the Nation's Capital in the same manner that we would deal with the question of a post office in a county seat town.

I feel certain that all of us would support a Senator in the location of a post office in any Senator's State. But when we are considering the location of an airport, I am certain that we must take into consideration our national obligation,

our obligation to the four and one-half million people who are arriving and departing each year by air, not because they are coming to Virginia, to Burke, Chantilly, or some other place, but because they are coming to Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, on business. Those travelers include the Senator's constituents, my constituents, and the constituents of all other Senators from the remaining States. We have a national obligation to provide an airport capable of handling modern jet aircraft safely. We have an obligation to relieve what we now know to be a hazardous condition at the Washington airport. It is the most crowded airspace at any airport in the United States.

Yet the Senator from Maryland, in order to please the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, and to have a busy airport, has helped to block a second airport for Washington. Last year he helped to lead the fight to block the construction of a second airport for Washington at Burke. He is now doing the same thing. Next year it will be the same story again and again and again, while the traffic pattern becomes worse.

FLYING IS ON BORROWED TIME

It is time to stop flying on borrowed time. It is time to move along and do the thing which any number of study commissions have recommended since 1950. Six or seven Administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, each new on the job, have studied the program. They all arrived at the same answer, namely, the Burke site.

I do not care whether the second Washington airport is built at Burke, Chantilly, Annandale, or elsewhere. I want a second airport for the Washington, D. C. area before there is a catastrophe which might make widows of the wives of 15 or 20 Senators.

A great many Senators, Representatives, constituents, and Government officials are flying in this congested airspace while we play politics for the city of Baltimore. Land speculation, in order to hold property for residential development instead of selling it at farm-land prices, bars the selection of a site anywhere within reasonable distance of the main part of Washington.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will yield to the distinguished Senator. I hope he will not take up all of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall be very brief. I resent the implication of the Senator from Oklahoma that we are playing politics. I am not playing politics. When the International Airport at Friendship was established, \$4 million of Federal funds went into that airport. My predecessor in office succeeded in having the airport placed there. He made statements on the floor of the Senate which were concurred in at the time the money was appropriated, to the effect that it would be used as a Baltimore-Washington airport. It was established for that purpose. The Senator would build another airport when there is a fine facility within 45 minutes of the heart of Washington, a facility which is not being

used. We cannot do that with the people's money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The passengers do not wish to use it, but I say they should be forced to use it during the construction of the second Washington airport.

Mr. BUTLER. How does the Senator propose to go about forcing them?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am satisfied that at that time, the statistics regarding schedules will show that the schedules will saturate the Friendship Airport to the point where the Senator from Maryland will be trying to get rid of Washington traffic.

We do not desire to be an unwanted tenant of the Baltimore airport, when the more frequent air schedules available at Friendship Airport saturate the facilities there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that unintentionally the Senator from Oklahoma is blaming the Senators from Maryland a little too much, when the ones who should be blamed for the condition of the appropriation bill are the members of the Committee on Appropriations. The report would not deprive Washington of another airport. The only thing it does is to recommend something. It does not deprive the area around metropolitan Washington of another airport.

I will tell the Senator why we are against Burke as the site for the second airport. At places it will be necessary to fill in 70 feet of earth, and at other places it will be necessary to dig out 70 feet of earth. Not only that, but I see on the floor the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who is opposed to it. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] who were elected to represent Virginia. Representative BROYHILL was elected to represent his district in Virginia. They are the ones who are opposed to the Burke site. We are only trying to carry out the idea that they would know more about where the site of the second airport should be than the Senator from New Mexico and the other members of the Appropriations Committee. Is that not the situation, more or less?

AIRPORT NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. MONRONEY. I regretfully find myself in opposition to the position taken by the Senators from Maryland, both of whom I respect as being two of our greatest and finest Senators. I also regret to be in disagreement with the Senators from Virginia.

I maintain that the location of the second airport for Washington is not a matter for local determination on the basis of civic or State or county pride, or for determination by any city or county in Maryland or Virginia. It is a national problem because of the necessity for giving the Nation's Capital, with traffic from the 48 States coming into it, the best possible air facilities.

If we were dealing solely with a local condition in Virginia, there would be no question about the fact that the location of an airport site, for example, would be the concern exclusively of the people

living in those areas. If the citizens of the counties surrounding Washington in the State of Virginia or the citizens of surrounding counties in Maryland are adamant against allowing Washington to have a second airport, then we become the prisoner of those areas adjacent to Washington, for whom we have done so much in building up their economy and making them prosperous sections of their States, by serving as the home communities for many public employees of the United States Government.

HOW MANY TIMES?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder whether the Senator would tell us how many occasions he knows when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate has studied the problem and made the recommendation that the second airport should be built at Burke.

Mr. MONRONEY. No less than four times, to my understanding. The first was when the bill was passed in the 81st Congress, in September 1950. Money was appropriated for a study. It was again studied 3 years ago when I was chairman of the subcommittee, at which time the committee again directed the Civil Aeronautics Authority, through the Department of Commerce, to come back to Congress on January 1 with a recommendation and request for money for the construction of the Burke airport; or, if Burke was not suitable, to recommend a site which was suitable. That was the unanimous decision of the committee.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TOUGHER THAN RUSSIANS

The Civil Aeronautics Authority looked into three different sites, as the distinguished Senator will remember. At first the CAA recommended Andrews Air Force Base, then Friendship, and then Burke, in that order. On investigation and restudy by our committee, they reversed this. It was realized that there was more chance of getting a field away from the Russians than there was a chance of getting the Air Force to permit Andrews to be used as a civilian airport. The CAA then did not like Friendship Airport. They then came back again to the Burke site as the best choice.

Again the following year, cooperating with the President's request, we studied the problem. We again approved what had been selected by all the aviation authorities; namely, the Burke site.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the statement on page 664 of the hearings on the pending appropriation bill, as follows:

We consider it highly significant that all organizations heard from who are in a position to utilize this expert knowledge are united in their choice of the Burke site. They include:

- The United States Department of Commerce.
- The Civil Aeronautics Administration.
- The executive branch of the United States Government.
- The Air Transport Association.
- Civil Air Patrol of Virginia.
- Air Line Pilots Association.

The Washington Board of Trade.
Francis Dodd McHugh, consultant, in 1955
Fairfax County master plan.

Does the Senator have any knowledge of any organizations, other than possibly local organizations in Virginia, that are opposed to the Burke site, and aside from the very praiseworthy—we shall say—opposition of the Senators from Maryland? Does he have any knowledge of other opposition to this particular location at Burke?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have never known of any aviation organization or any authority on aviation, either commercial or private, giving endorsement to any site other than Burke. The opposition seems to come entirely from the people who own property in the area, and from local residents who do not want to have an airport built in that area.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that if this matter were referred to the Air Modernization Board, the Board would be considering a proposal which would be contrary to the real purpose for which the Air Modernization Board was established? Therefore the Board would have to spend a considerable amount of time in determining the location of the second airport, rather than spending the time for which it was created.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the Senator. The Air Modernization Board was established because of plane crashes. It was established because we could not wait any longer in view of the fact that the situation aloft—I repeat, the situation aloft—was reaching a point of saturation and grave danger. It was necessary to develop new communications systems and new radar procedures, and new radio beams, new electronics, and so on.

SHOULD SCIENTISTS BAKE BREAD?

This highly scientific organization has no more to do with the selection of an airport than a scientist has to do with baking a loaf of bread. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is trusted with the spending of all the money appropriated by Congress for the planning of airports in all the 48 States. They are apparently competent to do that in all the 48 States; but now it is said they must not do it in the District of Columbia. Why?

It is because the property owners in the nearby areas feel that they do not want the airport built there. The matter has been investigated a great many times, and each time the Civil Aeronautics Authority decided that Burke is the best site.

Now it is said that someone else should make the inquiry all over again. It is said that the Air Modernization Board should do it. That Board was created for a completely different reason than to make this sort of study.

Why not appropriate now? I would look with more enthusiasm on the suggestion for having the Air Modernization Board study the matter if the Committee on Appropriations had appropriated \$12,500,000 and said, "We will build it wherever the Air Modernization Board determines it should be built." At least we would be getting something done. As it is, we are merely

going to have more delay. It will be the same delay that was brought about a year ago in this Chamber. It is like seeing a movie over again. Every time the appropriation comes before the Senate, the Senators from Maryland dust off their speeches, and we get a dusting off of all the same testimony of all the same witnesses, year after year.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator know of an agency any more qualified to consider the location of the second airport than the CAA?

CAA HAS EXPERTS

Mr. MONRONEY. It is the one agency of the Government that has all the experts and all the necessary information on devices, landing aids, radio range patterns, length of runways, air conditions, wind patterns, and modern layouts of airports. It has been doing that work for the 48 States. It has been authorized to expend not only \$70 million of Government funds, but \$70 million of matching funds from the States, including the State represented by the Senator from Florida, and my own State. Why is that Authority incompetent to select a second Washington airport site? It is because a few people living in the nearby area object. However, even at Burke, the people who want the airport located there are in the majority, according to polls taken in that area.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, the Air Modernization Board was established to develop and select such systems and devices and procedures as will best serve the civil and military needs for safe and efficient air traffic control. It seems to me that is a different matter than the selection of airport sites.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is as different as day is different from night. That Board is concerned principally with communications matters and with radar, and so forth.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Board were to undertake the selection of an airport site, we would be extending the authority of the Board in asking them to undertake an activity in which it was not empowered to engage by the legislation which created it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly. I should like to read a fine editorial published in Saturday's Washington Evening Star, entitled "Still Stacked Up." The editorial reads as follows:

STILL STACKED UP

The latest Congressional action on the politics-ridden airport front leaves the Washington airport problem still up in the air and circling around with no place to land—stacked up, as the pilots say. There has been some fancy and fantastic stalling on the airport issue from some years, but nothing more frustrating than the baffling move just made by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The committee not only has recommended another study of airport sites—of which there has been too many already—but has proposed that it be made by a board created for an entirely different purpose.

Plainly stated, the committee found the airport problem too hot, politically, to handle. Aligned solidly against the President and his aviation advisers, who urged resumption of work at the Burke (Va.) site, were legislators from Virginia and Maryland. So the committee killed the Burke appropriation and suggested that the new

Airways Modernization Board study, investigate and recommend a site, either entirely new, or the remodeling of a present airport that is, in its opinion, suitable for a modern airport adequate to serve the needs of metropolitan Washington."

The trouble with this recommendation is that the Board's purpose, as described by Edward P. Curtis, former presidential air adviser and author of the proposal, is not to encroach on functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which has the duty of picking an airport site here, but to develop and consolidate overall, nationwide systems of air traffic control. That is a big job by itself. To saddle the board, in addition, with Washington's controversial airport site problem would be unfair—and highly irregular besides. The strategy of the opponents of an airport at Burke is to study the matter to death. It is regrettable that the Senate Appropriations Committee, brushing aside considerations of public safety, convenience and necessity, has allowed itself to become a party to such risky strategy.

Mr. President, there is no hope that by January 1, 1958, we shall be any further along than we were on January 1, of this year, when we yielded to the pleas that the matter needed more study—at that time, by a Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I do not know what additional developments which will be helpful could occur or what additional information will be available by January 1, 1958.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I know the Senator from Oklahoma has made a very careful study of this entire situation. I think he will agree with me that the most important consideration is safety—particularly safety in connection with the taking off and landing of airplanes. I wish to read an item and recommendation as follows—and it is a recommendation by the White House:

White House advisers differ with CAA. The Curtis report on "Modernizing the National System of Aviation Facilities" (the White House, May 1957) —

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Maryland read that again? I assume he is reading the item verbatim, and I wish him to read all of it verbatim to the Senate.

Mr. BEALL. Yes. It reads as follows:

White House advisers differ with CAA. The Curtis report on "Modernizing the National System of Aviation Facilities" (the White House, May 1957), recommends spacing airports from 16 to 40 miles apart depending upon the centerline of the airport's instrument-approach path. The Burke site is only 12.8 miles from National Airport. The Army's very important Davison Field at Fort Belvoir is only 5.3 miles from the Burke site. The danger area of Quantico Marine Base, over which flying is prohibited, is less than 12 miles south of the Burke site. In addition, the privately owned airports in Fairfax County (e. g., the Washington-Virginia Airport at Bailey's Crossroads) are much less distant from Burke than the minimum recommended in the Curtis report.

Mr. MONRONEY. The reference to the danger zone of the Quantico Marine Base is, I believe, a reference to the flight pattern north of the landing field.

Mr. BEALL. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree that Friendship Airport is out of the danger zone, and is in a dif-

ferent channel, and that transatlantic planes landing there would be an entirely different channel?

I know the Senator from Oklahoma has accused some of us of perhaps being a little politically minded. We do not object to that statement, because if we were not politically minded, we would not be here.

But certainly safety is the most important matter for consideration.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Maryland for safety. Certainly I do not believe that the Burke site would have been recommended again and again and again, after study and restudy, if it were unsafe.

FRIENDSHIP NOT PERFECT

So far as Friendship Airport is concerned, it lacks a great deal from being a completely safe airport, because it is directly on the New York-Philadelphia-Washington run; and in case of stacking, planes landing at the Friendship Airport would be directly in that flight pattern.

So Friendship Airport is not the perfect airport. But still it is safer to use it as an auxiliary airport, in connection with the Washington Airport, rather than not to have an auxiliary airport at all. Therefore, I think that during the 3 or 4 years required for construction of the second Washington airport, we should gratefully accept the invitation to use the Baltimore airport, and to disembark passengers for Washington there, approximately 1 hour's travel time from Washington, rather than overcrowd the traffic pattern at the Washington airport.

But certainly the recommendation in the Curtis report is that airports be spaced approximately 16 miles apart. I submit that the statement by the Curtis report was that the spacing be "on the order of 16 miles", which is the general median; and it is 14½ miles from the center of the Washington airport to the center of the Burke site. That is about as good a separation as can be found in an area which is so highly congested and has few airport sites to choose from.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President—

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I know how hard the Senator from Oklahoma has worked on this matter during the past several years. But does not he think the invitation to use Friendship Airport should be accepted?

Mr. MONRONEY. I remember that it has become an issue in only about the last year and one-half, when we were getting ready to build the second airport at Washington. Then, suddenly, the very capable, competent, and industrious Senator from Maryland thought it would be good business to get some more schedules lured into the Baltimore Airport.

And then the fight began. I am in favor of having the Senator succeed in getting more schedules for Baltimore, but not at the expense of the safety of the situation existing at Washington, the Nation's Capital.

Mr. BEALL. The airport is not in Baltimore; it is at Friendship.

IS THIS MORE RABBIT HASH?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is something like the story about rabbit hash, when

it was said that the hash was composed of 1 rabbit and 1 horse.

Friendship is much closer to Baltimore than it is to Washington. If Friendship were as close to Washington as it is to Baltimore, I think we should use the Friendship Airport and should accept the very courteous invitation to use the Baltimore site—and to use it part time, in connection with the offer to use it, as an adjunct to the Washington Airport.

But certainly the Nation's Capital is entitled to have its own second airport; and passengers coming to Washington should not be required to spend on the highway the hour that is required to travel between Baltimore and Washington.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that the Civil Aeronautics Board could not arbitrarily require the airlines to use the Baltimore site, in the case of passengers scheduled for Washington? Whether the Civil Aeronautics Board has been dragging its feet in the matter of holding hearings about switching passengers to Friendship is a debatable point. But I am sure the constituents of the Senator from Oklahoma and the residents of Michigan who buy tickets to travel to the Nation's Capital want to come to Washington, D. C., and do not want to be landed near Baltimore, and then have to pay additional fare for transportation from that airport to downtown Washington, to say nothing of the additional time required.

I should also like to comment on the suggestion that Friendship Airport be used as the second Washington airport. It happened to be my pleasure, during the past week end, to be visited by one of the oldest pilots of the Capital Air Lines. We discussed this very problem. He said, "If you think we are nervous now about coming to the National Airport, can you imagine what it would be like if we were going to use Friendship Airport and if we had to be stacked up in the most heavily trafficked airplanes in the world—those between Washington and New York City."

Mr. MONRONEY. The airplanes between Washington and New York City go right off the end of the runway at Friendship.

Mr. POTTER. Yes; a plane right off the end of the Friendship runway is in the Washington to New York pattern. That pilot said it is one of the most dangerous pieces of air in the world, insofar as air traffic is concerned.

So the question which I think we must decide here is whether we, as a Congress, are going to select the definite site for a second Washington airport—whether that is our responsibility, or whether it is the responsibility of the governmental agencies concerned. Certainly the decision which has been made was not just made "off the cuff." Instead, it was made after repeated and repeated study. All the agencies concerned have agreed on the Burke site. Whether that is the correct decision, I do not know, and I do not believe any other Member of the Senate knows. But time and time

again this agency of the Government has made that decision.

DIFFERENT ADMINISTRATIONS AGREE

Mr. MONRONEY. And the decision has been made under different administrations.

Mr. POTTER. Yes, it has been made under different administrations.

If we depend upon having the Congress select the site for a second Washington airport, there may never be a second Washington airport. I say that because, regardless of the site which is selected, there will always be people who will say—as is now being said—that they do not want a certain site chosen because it is too close to property in which they are interested. I am convinced that if there is ever to be a second Washington airport, the decision must be made by the authorized agency, the one which has been delegated to make the recommendation.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who probably knows more about our air problems than does any other Member of the Senate, for his diligent work as a member of the Air Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce. He has worked diligently, not only on this problem, but on all other problems connected with our growing air age; and he has been particularly concerned about safety.

I share his concern about the near misses which are happening at the Washington Airport. Do we have to wait until there is a major crash? I do not want the finger pointed at me as one who has been dragging his heels about the second Washington airport.

So I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for his activity in this connection.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks.

By way of reference to the existing facts, I should like to refresh the memory of the Senator from Michigan about the difficulty we had in getting the first Washington airport constructed. At the old airport, a dog-leg turn used to be required, and the planes had to come over the high-tension wires of the Pennsylvania Railroad. At the time when all the agencies concerned had recommended the site at Gravelly Point, property owners in that area were constantly protesting; and, as a result, the Congress never did take action.

F. D. R. HAD A DREAM

Finally, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said he had a dream, one night, that 21 passengers on a DC-3—the type of plane then being used—were killed when the plane crashed when coming into the airfield at Washington. So he decided that WPA funds would be used to build the new Washington Airport; and so decided that the new airport was built at Gravelly Point, under his order. But that is the only reason why the Gravelly Point airport was built. If the matter had been left to Congress, that airport never would have been built. Today, it is one of the largest and one of the best in the country, and it handles a tremendous volume of air traffic.

PROPERTY PRICES INVOLVED

Of course many property owners wish to have their property sold after it has

been subdivided into 50-foot lots for residential purposes, instead of having their property condemned for airport use while the property still is in timber or is being used for agricultural purposes—which is the situation in the case of most of the land in the area of the Burke site.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for discussing the question so decisively and clearly. As a member of the subcommittee I was disappointed in the committee's action. I tried to have another airport established. I have felt for a number of years that we should have a new airport for the National Capital. There is too much air traffic coming from every section of the world to the National Capital to warrant any longer delay in remedying the inadequate airport facilities which exist at the National Capital. An accident could occur because of the overstacking. To use Friendship Airport and continue to have the air stacked with airplanes flying in the airways of the eastern seaboard, I would not approve.

I have served on the Appropriations Committee for a number of years. Year after year we have come practically to home base, and just before we were about to put our toe on the plate we had to back up for another period of 6 months or a year's time for another study. We got so close this year that the House included a \$12.5 million appropriation in its appropriation bill. Many studies have previously been made. Again we got to the stage where the committee was about to act, but action will be delayed until January 15, until there can be another study made by the Airways Modernization Board, although that group has no more authority to make the study than Mr. Smith in New Hampshire has. We borrowed that group, so to speak, to take a look at the problem. If we have hearings, every interested person will demand to be heard, and it will be a year from now before we can determine the matter. That is the history we have had of the new airport for 5 years. In the last weeks of the session, we are again trying to determine what we should do about a new airport.

Burke may not be the proper place, but we have come very close to a decision, and the Civil Aeronautics Board has said the land area at Burke is as good as any other area in the vicinity of Washington, and would be as good a place as any other area for building the airport. I am not the master in the dispute, but I am at least one citizen, I am serving in the Congress, and I am serving on the Appropriations Committee. We are coming to the last step, and now it is being proposed that we back up, with no excuse as to why we should back up.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, who was the only member in the Appropriations Committee who voted for the Burke Airport.

Mr. THYE. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand I am wrong. Other Senators also voted for it. I am sorry. I did not want to mislead the Senate that anywhere near a ma-

jority of the Appropriations Committee voted for it.

Mr. THYE. We were in executive session. That is why I cannot disclose who the others were, but I was not alone.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very sorry I gave that incorrect information. I think I read it in the newspapers.

I should like to say, supplementing what the Senator from Minnesota has stated, that we do not need the Air Modernization Board to make the study. What we need to do is put Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and Mr. Alcorn, chairman of the Republican National Committee, and Mr. Gallup, of the Gallup poll, on such a Board, because the Burke proposal is not being turned down on the basis of aeronautical engineering recommendations, but on the basis of a popularity contest for airport facilities adjacent to Washington.

We cannot permit that, because air safety in the Washington area is a national problem, and not a matter for a county facility to consider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the debate on this subject has become a little heated, and some things have been said that probably were not meant to be said. We are trying to arrive at a solution. No one has been more seriously concerned about the problem than has the Senator from Washington, because I had in my committee the bill that authorized the settlement of this matter 7 years ago. The bill provided that there should be a second airport. We were all in agreement 7 years ago that there should be a second airport for Washington.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has been working on this matter in committee, and I have been continuously urging that a second airport should be built. In the meantime, the Friendship Airport near Baltimore was established. In the meantime, also, the CAA, which has great responsibilities in this matter, looked into the problem, and even it at one time did not know where the airport should go. So if there has been some delay, it cannot be laid at the doorstep of the Congress or the Appropriations Committee. Months and months were spent on the matter, as the Senator from Oklahoma and all other members of the committee know. We sent letter after letter to the Commerce Department asking it to please make a decision on a second airport.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that after 1952, when the appropriation for Burke was denied by Congress, the Democratic administration did not ask for funds, and the Republican administration did not ask for funds, and that the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, called hearings, and the committee directed that funds be asked for not later than January of the following year? The movement for a second airport started with the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,

the Senator from Washington. If he had had his way, we would have had the airport operating now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think we are talking a little too much about whether the airport should be at Burke, Friendship, or Chantilly, because no Senator knows a great deal about where the airport should be located.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my statement.

I do not think anyone in this body thinks that the airport should be involved in Republican or Democratic politics. Everybody wants a second airport. I think we shall someday look with some amusement on the debate taking place, because by the time the question is settled—which will be in January, if I have my way, whether the committee amendment is agreed to or not—I believe we will realize that in the next 3 or 4 years all three airports will be necessary. One can hardly board an airplane in Washington. Perhaps the Baltimore airport is less crowded, but there are not as many planes leaving from there. Anyway, we are all trying to get a second airport, because National Airport has become overcrowded.

There has been local opposition, that is true. Some of it has been quite valid. It is not only a question of real estate. There is a problem of cost involved. I think the record will show that an airport at Chantilly, which is another alternative, would cost much less. I do not know why we cannot measure distances, but my best information is that, with a new road which would be built, Chantilly would be only 2 miles farther away than Burke. Actually, now it is 8 miles farther.

The White House set up a board, and rightly so, to consider the whole problem of air safety and airspace. The Chairman of the Board is General Curtis. It was a must, and there was a hurry for it. General Quesada was recommended. The committee did not even meet, but it was polled, and there was no opposition. The Board was established because of overcrowding, and to look into questions of air safety and airspace. The first job of the Board was to consider the conflict over navigation equipment, which cost about \$800 million more than it should have—obsolete equipment.

In the meantime, there are available Chantilly, Burke, and Friendship. Seven years have passed. I think the Appropriations Committee, whether it acted wisely or not, has tried to move closer and closer toward authorization of a second airport. That was the main objective. We have tried to iron out some of the difficulties. While all of that was going on, during the past 12 months, the Senator from Oklahoma and all of us on the committee worked on the question.

All of a sudden the Commerce Department has stated what it wants, after all these years. If the Department is entitled to make such a study month after month after month, I think the Congress is entitled to a couple months' study of the subject.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my statement.

I think the two Senators from Virginia, who can correct me if I am wrong, are reconciled to the fact that we are going to have to have a second airport in Virginia, near the National Capital. I think there is a problem as to whether or not it should be in Burke or in Chantilly. The Senator from Oklahoma, I know, would be tickled if tomorrow a steam shovel started a second airport at Chantilly, so that its completion would be in sight. We have that problem. The Senate committee did not work against Burke. They voted not to appropriate \$12 million for a second airport at this time. The CAA had finally said, "We will recommend Burke."

I do not know whether the Department of Commerce will change its mind. It has done so 3 times that I know of in the past 4 years.

It was not the purpose of the vote of the Senate committee to prevent a second airport. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] knows my position on this matter. We are all trying to find ways and means to do the job. Nobody was voting against one site or for another site. We are pretty well pledged in the committee that come January we are going to appropriate this amount of money to start a second airport.

The Civil Aeronautics Board did come up with a recommendation. I do not know whether it was right or wrong. I am no technician. I am not a safety engineer. It was thought airports ought to be at least 16 miles apart. I believe that is desirable. In taking care of airspace and air safety throughout the United States, the question of spacing of airports becomes important. The CAA, in recommending the location of airports, does take that question into consideration. The air patterns are all crowded.

Apparently Chantilly is a little bit less crowded on the air pattern on a direct line east and west; but I do not know. However, I want the Record to be clear that we are all trying to accomplish the same thing. The end result will be the same. I will pledge myself to that.

I think every member of the Committee on Appropriations will agree that whether the airport is built at Burke, at Chantilly, or whether Friendship will be used, or the day a new airport is dedicated will not be delayed one iota.

We turned to the so-called experts. As a matter of fact, I was not present when most of the discussion took place, for I was attending a meeting of my own committee on some of these matters.

I think the experts might be able to resolve the problem. They are experts, and they want to solve it. They are in charge of air safety and airspace, and they make recommendations.

The President of the United States has authority in this matter, through the Department of Commerce. The bill provides that the Department of Commerce and the Department of Defense shall be represented on the Board, with one man as the President's adviser. He is General

Quesada. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and I know him well, when he takes action, he takes action, and he takes it fast.

I hope we will not get into finger pointing on this very important, serious matter, over a delay of 60 days or something of that kind, in view of the fact that everybody involved in this matter has backed and filled on several occasions.

This is not political at all. I do not blame the Senators from Maryland for trying to get some consideration for Friendship, but I will tell them that if air travel keeps increasing, as it has been increasing, we will be using Friendship and all the other airports around this vicinity.

Let us all get together and settle this problem as it should be settled, because we need to have the question resolved. The very fact that an appropriation will be made is important. Construction will go forward just as readily if it is decided to use Burke tomorrow, because of the condemnation features involved at the Burke site. I am informed that nobody wants the land at Chantilly, particularly, and the Government could go right ahead at that location.

I hope we will accept this bill as it is. I do not think the Appropriations Committee has made a mistake in its recommendation, because, as I have said, the net result is going to be the same in the end. No one in the Appropriations Committee has fought more for a second airport than has the Senator from Washington.

So far as I am concerned, we can provide the appropriation now and have the decision in January. That is all right with me. I will vote for that. Then the appropriation will be available, and we can get started on something.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield the floor. I have said enough.

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to address a question or two to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to clear up one point. I know of the Senator's interest, and I am aware of the dynamic leadership the Senator has furnished toward attempting to solve the problem of the second airport. I understood the Senator to say that there was nothing in this particular bill which would in any way preclude Burke from consideration as the second site. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, yes.

Mr. BIBLE. The thing which bothered me was a statement I observed on page 5 of the report, which is:

that the Airways Modernization Board study terms of Public Law 762 of the 81st Congress and in furtherance of that study—

I am reading from the third paragraph of page 5, I will say to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. I continue to read:

in furtherance of that study investigate and recommend to the Congress by January 15,

1958, a site (either entirely new or the remodeling of a present airport)—

My question is directed to the significance of the language which was placed in the parentheses. It seemed to me, in reading the report, that it was indicated the Appropriations Committee had directed the Airways Modernization Board to make this study, but to bring back a recommendation of a site provided it was entirely new or involved the remodeling of a present airport. If that interpretation were the correct one, it would seem to eliminate consideration of Burke. I think the Record should be clear on that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also think the Record should be clear. The report reflects the general discussion. The language means an entirely new site or the remodeling of an airport. By "new" we mean a new airport.

Mr. BIBLE. The use of that language does not in any way attempt to restrict the study to be made by the Airways Modernization Board?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. If I thought the language were to be interpreted in any other way than as I have stated, I would ask permission now of the chairman of the committee to have the language in parentheses stricken from the report.

Mr. BIBLE. There is no question in the mind of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the Burke site, as well as Chantilly and Friendship, will be considered in the study between now and the first of January?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. I do not know what the Board will do. They may come back and say, "Burke." That will be the end of it, if they do. They may say, "We have looked them all over. The CAA has looked them all over. Everybody has looked them all over." It might be Burke. I do not want that site precluded by any language.

Mr. BIBLE. I wanted to clarify the point by questioning the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I simply wish to point out in connection with the question that there is nothing in chapter 1 about Burke. There was nothing directly in the committee report which said that the CAA had selected Burke. The act of 1950 gave them that authority, and there was appropriated \$12½ million to start. The words may not have been very accurately used.

The words "entirely new" were to be the opposite of perhaps the utilization of Andrews, which would be a remodeling. The words "entirely new" meant to go into the wilderness and start grading, to build the airport, as opposed to taking Andrews or some other military base and remodeling it. Those words had nothing to do with the site, for or against Burke.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate that comment by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I should like to make a brief comment

on the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada. There is no question at all that the words "entirely new" embrace Burke, Chantilly, or any other new site. There was substantial sentiment in the committee for the elimination of Burke, but after long discussion it was decided that the words in the committee report should be broad enough to cover any new site anywhere, so that the previous legislation would remain unimpaired. The legislation of 1950 simply authorized—not Burke, not Chantilly, not Friendship, not Andrews—it authorized the selection by the Secretary of Commerce of a site in the area around the Capital of the Nation. The legislation did not confine it to Virginia or Maryland or any particular locality.

It is the intention of the committee, after long discussion, to leave the matter completely open as to what site will be selected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless I am mistaken, the committee will make the decision in January, regardless of what it may be. That is my understanding. I am going to hold all Members to account at that time to furnish the money. It might be Burke, as well as any place else.

I say that the net result will be the same. I think that is the feeling of the entire committee. I am sure I express their feeling. It was my understanding, that "come January we are going to appropriate this money," and then something will happen. I do not know exactly where the airport will be placed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the light of the Senator's statement, why would it not be a good idea to appropriate the \$12.5 million? If we do not appropriate the money now, as the Senator well appreciates, when we return in January we will have to go through the hearings all over again, and it will be very difficult to get the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce passed early in the year. We are now in the month of August. We know that frequently we have good intentions but not enough time to carry them out.

Why could we not amend the bill so as to appropriate the \$12.5 million, and then, on line 24, say "to remain unexpended until January 15, 1958"? Then we would accomplish exactly what the able Senator from Washington says he wants to bring about. We would provide the money, and we would merely wait until January 15 to have the Airways Modernization Board recommend where the airport ought to be located. The minute the Board makes the recommendation, we will not have to wait any longer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I would be perfectly willing to vote for what he has suggested. I made that suggestion in the committee, informally. I should be happy to see that done.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if we could ask the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee how he feels about the suggestion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am willing to do what the Senator suggests. I think it would clear up what are not necessarily fears, but perhaps could be called doubts, which the Senator from Oklahoma and I have had all this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. I believe it would be a happy compromise. We could have one more agency look into the matter, but if a determination were made by January 15, 1958, then we would not have to wait for the next 2 or 3 months while the Appropriations Committee was holding its normal hearings.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the committee discussed that suggestion and decided against it, for reasons which I think were eminently sound. The request was for a \$35 million appropriation to do 1 year's work at the level which was intended. The authorization originally had been for \$14 million, and the House cut down the budget request of \$35 million to \$12,500,000, to keep within the amount of the authorization still outstanding.

A study will be made by the Airways Modernization Board, and the Board will report its findings and conclusions to the Congress. Both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Florida have stated that they are prepared to go along with the Board's recommendation, whatever it may be. We think we can start with a fresh slate. In the meantime, time will not be wasted, because if Burke, Chantilly, or some other location is decided upon, there must be plans and specifications prepared prior to the beginning of construction work. The mere moving of earth will require long planning and extensive specifications. In the case of Burke, the estimate is that 16 million yards will have to be moved. Incidentally, that will call for some fills of 70 feet, and some cuts of 70 feet. I do not think I need to tell Senators who are experienced in roadbuilding or construction work of any kind that, immediately following a 70-foot fill, it is not advisable to place a heavy structure on top of it. The question of delay enters into the picture.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator allow me to complete my statement? I have put in a great deal of study on this subject.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that there are no politics involved. I do not know of anyone living in Fairfax, Va., or in nearby Maryland, who is a Florida citizen, voting in Florida, who has expressed any interest in this matter.

Furthermore, if we are talking about Republican politics, I note that while our two distinguished colleagues from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], who happen to be of that party, are pulling in one direction, a long article in the morning newspaper relates that the Republican Party of Virginia is pulling in the other direction. So there is just about as little politics involved as possible.

The Senator from Florida did not ask to get into this controversy. He is chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies. That includes not only the Department of Commerce generally, but also CAA and CAB. So when the question arose last year the Senator from Florida conducted hearings in the full committee on the supplemental request which came in about 14 months ago, as I recall.

We have not been idle on this question. In the second supplemental for 1957 we took 124 pages of testimony on this matter. They will be found in the hearings on the second supplemental bill for the previous fiscal year.

The special committee, of which I was appointed chairman—I presume because I am chairman of the subcommittee which handles these appropriations—and I see our distinguished chairman nodding—held hearings in January and February of this year. Those hearings are contained in a record of 341 printed pages.

In August of this year, when the supplemental request for \$35 million was submitted, we held further hearings. Those hearings ran to 135 pages on this matter.

The other day a suggestion was made which I think was an excellent one. It came to the full committee from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], but at the original suggestion of the Senator from Washington, [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendation was that we make use of the new Airways Modernization Board. We were all glad to receive such a suggestion, after looking at the 600 pages of testimony, and realizing some of the complications involved. We were glad to turn to expert advisers, whose specific duty it is to deal with the problem of security of flying, and with the proper division of airspace, particularly the proper division of airspace as between commercial and civilian flying on the one hand, and military flying on the other.

This problem would be relatively simple if it were not for the fact that the airspace around the Capital is so congested with military flying.

First, there is the great base at Andrews Field. That was the original selection of the CAA, and all others concerned. They all preferred it to Burke, Chantilly, or any other location. But the Air Force seems to have a permanent option on that site, and no one has seen fit seriously to challenge it. It is the preferred spot from every point of view that I have heard about.

In addition to Andrews Field, there are two bases directly across the Potomac from the National Airport, which are instrument controlled by the same tower. They use a part of the airspace used by National. I refer to Bolling Field, which is an Air Force field, and Anacostia Field, which is a Navy field.

There is a small field at Fort Belvoir. I have forgotten the name of it. My dis-

tinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] reminded me of it the other day. I believe it is called Davidson Field.

At Quantico there is an airfield. In addition, the Armed Forces have set up 2 large inviolable areas, 1 back of Quantico, and the other around the Dahlgren Naval Proving Station, where airplanes are not permitted to fly. So one of the grave problems is the accommodation of Armed Forces needs to the problems of commercial flying.

After we were appointed on this special subcommittee I think we were pretty diligent. We held 5 days of hearings. I do not know of any Senators who have spent more time in trying to iron out a problem of this magnitude which was not directly of importance to them.

Of course, all of us travel by air. I have been to Florida on 15 weekends this year; I have been to Atlanta twice; to Asheville once, only yesterday; I have been to San Francisco once; and, of course, a group of us went to Vienna, Ga., on a sad mission a few days ago. So I have made use of these facilities a total of about 20 times over a limited period of time. However, in the matter of providing the safest and most reasonable arrangement that can be made for serving this area, I would place my own personal security far down on the list of important items.

When we went into the question, we found a great many points which had been given scant attention or no attention at all. Except for those on the committee, I dare say that there is no Senator listening to me who knows that there is a conflict of airspace between National and Burke, and a lesser conflict of airspace between National and Chantilly, which will result in a sizable loss of stacking facilities at National if the airport is built at either Burke or Chantilly.

The CAA has made no mention of that factor in its recent frenzied recommendation of Burke. I have before me the original study by the CAA. I shall read a portion of it into the RECORD. I think it is a very important part of the entire picture.

I read from page 9 of Technical Development Report No. 187 of the Civil Aeronautical Administration, dated November 1952:

Activation of Burke Airport will interfere with the west holding stack presently adopted for Washington National Airport and will probably require that the Washington National Airport approach system revert to a one-stack operation with a primary stack at the outer marker. Simulation tests indicate that this change would reduce the acceptance rate of the Washington National Airport somewhat and would greatly increase the communications workload of the approach control position.

I do not believe that many Senators knew that that question was involved in the discussion. Certainly the Senator from Florida did not know it until we began to hold detailed hearings.

Only the other day when this question arose we explored it again with David D. Thomas, Director of Air Traffic Control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who has charge of this field of operations. I quote from the hearing record, beginning on page 555.

Senator HOLLAND. What do you mean by this significant paragraph because, really, this is the one that has caused me the most trouble in trying to understand your recommendations.

EXCERPT FROM ENGINEER'S REPORT

What we have before us is the technical recommendations of your own agency discussing Burke and National as related to each other, and I quote from it. This is the third paragraph on page 9:

"Activation of Burke Airport will interfere with the west holding stack presently adapted for Washington National Airport and will probably require that the Washington National Airport approach revert to a one-stack operation with the primary stack at the outer marker. Simulation tests indicated that this change would reduce the acceptance rate of the Washington National Airport somewhat and would greatly increase the communications workload of the approach control position."

To me, that sounds like anything but a successful verdict. I would like for you to interpret it for the Record.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this deals with precisely the same point. The activation of the Burke Airport will interfere with the west holding stack. This is the Springfield stack. It will require us to eliminate it and it will require us to revert to a one-stack operation essentially. Since that time, with the major difference in studying Chantilly, Washington still reverts to that—

Senator HOLLAND. May we complete our consideration of the paragraph itself. The latter part of it says that it would reduce the acceptance of National. It would reduce the number of planes that could come in there; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. And that is still your statement?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

May I add that it would also be reduced at Chantilly.

Senator HOLLAND. Pardon me for interrupting, but I wanted you to complete that point.

It seemed to me you were telling Congress that, in that report, if both airports function at the same time, Burke and National, that the National's capacity would be necessarily lower and would have to operate as a one-stack holding operation; and that there would be, therefore, material interference.

As I understand it now, you are saying that that is exactly what you meant; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir. Our estimate is a reduction of about five operations per hour.

Senator HOLLAND. All right, you may proceed.

In the latter part of the same report to which I have heretofore referred, there is the statement that the location of the airport at Burke would mean that one airport or the other would have to be the primary airport, and the other one a secondary airport. As the reporting engineers see it, Burke would be the principal one, and National would be reduced to a secondary status.

To my mind that is a rather ridiculous thing, when we have the closest-in airport that I know anything about, near any large population center in the Nation, and when it seems to me that always it will be of very great importance to have National operating just as fully as it can, consistent with safety.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me complete the reading of the last paragraph, to which

I have already referred, but have not yet read. I quote from page 2 of the report:

The proximity of the Burke site to the Washington National Airport will tend to restrict the flow of traffic into the latter field by obviating the use of a west sector holding fix for feeding traffic into the Washington National Airport. This restriction may not be too serious if Burke becomes the principal airport in the Washington terminal area, since it is likely that Washington National Airport would then lose much of its present commercial traffic.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, who has studied the matter over a great many years, whether it is not a fact that the reference deals with Washington Airport being a single-runway airport. In other words, unless we build across the Potomac River, it is impossible to create parallel runways at Washington National Airport. The plan is at Burke or Chantilly—or whatever site is selected—to build new modern parallel runways, so that planes can land and take off at the same time. Certainly we do not want to build an obsolete airport, such as we have at Washington National Airport now. We want to build parallel runways, to handle the traffic.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe my distinguished friend from Oklahoma and I are trying to reach the same objective.

The point I make is that in locating the second airport, further consideration should be given to the fact that an airport located at Burke would diminish to a secondary position the National Airport and would cut down its stacking capacity to one-half its present stacking area.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the testimony was that it would cut down by 5 percent the landing capacity.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is incorrect on that point. The statement was that it would reduce from 40 to 35 the capacity per hour, and therefore would reduce it by 5 planes per hour.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 553 of the testimony, Mr. Thomas stated specifically that the complex of Burke and National would make it possible to have about 115 operations per hour. The complex at Chantilly and Washington National would make possible about 120 operations per hour. So there would be something less than 5 percent involved.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator means as between the use of Burke and Chantilly as a second airport. The statement is clear that it would cut down by 5 planes per hour, during instrument weather, the capacity of National Airport. The distinguished Senator will find that statement clearly made in the record. If he is interested in reading it, I shall have it pointed out to him.

The next point I found there was no general understanding about—although other Senators may have understood it, but apparently no one on our subcommittee fully understood it; and of course one of our ablest members had to be absent because of conditions existing at home, which were fully understood—but the four of us knew nothing about this point; namely, that the location at Burke would interfere with the long-range de-

velopment program of Fairfax County. There is no doubt about that at all.

The testimony of the membership of the planning board and the mute testimony of the map show that point very clearly, and there is no argument about it.

To state it as briefly as I may, the development of Fairfax County must be such that the drainage—both from the standpoint of storm sewers and sanitary sewers—must go forward so as to provide drainage in a southerly direction into the Potomac below the city of Washington, and must not go over a considerable mileage to the north in Fairfax County so as to drain into the Potomac River above Washington. Senators are fully familiar with the polluted condition of the Potomac River.

From that point of view, the watershed of Pohick Creek is the only one closely available to go southward, and that is cut almost in two by the Burke location, and that is the only other available close-by area for continued residential development of Fairfax County.

Whether the people there want it to be so or whether we want it to be so, that is a suburban residential county, and always will be. Such towns are sometimes referred to as bedroom towns. Fairfax County has grown from a population of 87,000 in the census of 1950 to 194,000 a few months ago, and the statement has been made that it is now well above 200,000. The growth has been great, so great as to use up rapidly the areas which are served by the sewerage system under the present plan, and to make it imperative that in the future there will be a chance to begin to develop the Pohick Creek area.

We had the testimony of two members of the board. I shall read briefly from the statement of Mrs. Anne Wilkins, a member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and of the Fairfax County Planning Commission. Her statement begins at page 614 of the hearings.

She is a very intelligent person and was very well able to handle herself at the hearing. I ask that the two paragraphs at the end of the section entitled "Effects on Development of Watershed," which appear on page 616 of the hearings, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There are two other watersheds in Fairfax County which presently serve as sources of water supply. Occoquan supplies Alexandria and a large part of Fairfax County. Accotink supplies Fort Belvoir. This leaves Cameron (Holmes Run, Tripps Run, and Back Lick Run), Pimmit, and Pohick watersheds open and available for intensive residential development. Cameron, Pimmit, and part of Accotink are sewered, or being sewered, under the current \$20 million sewer program. Development in these areas is expected to reach the saturation point before 1980. This will leave only the Pohick watershed open for future intensive development. Actually it is the only remaining watershed in which satisfactory sanitary sewer facilities can be provided economically for high-density residential development even without regard to protection of area

water supply. Trunk and collector sewers can be installed at reasonable cost to serve the entire watershed with a disposal plant on the Potomac where it will not interfere with anybody's water supply.

A large subdivision of 900 houses is in the planning stage just over the ridge in the Accotink watershed. One area of 1,100 acres in the upper Pohick watershed has been purchased for subdivision recently and is awaiting only sewer facilities before it gets underway. There are many other smaller-scale projects on various stages of completion within the general area.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mrs. Wilkins points out that there are two other watersheds which presently serve as sources of water supply. She points out that Cameron and Pimmit and a part of Accotink are sewered, or being sewered, under the current \$20 million sewer program. She states that this will leave only the Pohick watershed open for future intensive residential development. She states that development in the Cameron and Pimmit areas is expected to reach the saturation point before 1980. Therefore, Pohick is the only one left for future development.

Then she states that there is a large subdivision of 900 houses in the planning stage just over the ridge in the Accotink watershed. She states that 1 area of 1,100 acres in the upper Pohick watershed has been purchased for subdivision recently and is awaiting only sewer facilities before it gets under way.

She states also that there are many other smaller scale projects in various stages of completion within the general area.

We looked at the map, and went over it very carefully. I do not believe any member of the subcommittee was prejudiced in the matter.

In the same paragraph which I have placed in the RECORD, Mrs. Wilkins spoke about the \$20 million sewer program which is underway. They have done good long-range planning. They are very fine people and intelligent people, and they want to utilize to the best advantage the area within their county.

The areas across the main highway, on the other side of Fairfax County, around Chantilly, and going toward Loudoun County and in Loudoun County, are now zoned for agricultural development, because any general sewerage program would have to go to the upper area of the Potomac, and they ban any such plan, as a matter of decency, I am sure, whether required by law or not. They do not want to be parties to the further pollution of the sources of the water supply of this whole area.

Why has this matter been allowed to reach this deplorable stage, with a lack of recognition of those two points which I have made? There is no doubt about those two points. They show up in the RECORD time and time again. The CAA admits them freely. Why has it gotten to that stage?

The reason is because CAA did not carry out the injunction of Congress when, in 1950, we authorized them to choose a site somewhere around the National Capital, not specifying which State or which county, but requiring them to have a full consultation with the public officials and residents of the

area to be affected. They did not do that. It has been clearly demonstrated that not only did they not have any consultation, but we have had complete demonstration of the fact that the whole group or local public officials are completely out of humor—and justifiably so, I believe—because, while they cannot have the final say, they ought to be heard. They are handling the affairs of a rapidly growing county, which now contains 200,000 people in a limited area, and they had not been heard up to the time that we heard them. We gave them a chance to be heard at our hearings.

What are the facts with respect to those public officials? There were six members of the county Board of Supervisors, one from each magisterial district, up to 1953. All six were against the Burke site.

There have been 7 since then, and all 7 have been against the Burke site, until the election of the present incumbent from the Mount Vernon area, General Ovenshine, and he was in favor of going ahead at Burke or anywhere else where a location can be agreed upon. His is the only vote—out of the votes of 14 different members who have served on the board since the time of the first site selection by the CAA—in favor of the Burke site, because the other members know how critically necessary it is for the county to retain the site, and they also know that other locations are available, not only because they involve agricultural land, and thus are cheaper, but also because the land there is level and does not require the immense amount of grading that would be required at Burke.

At Burke, the difference between the highest and the lowest levels is 140 feet, which means that some fills 70 feet in depth would have to be made and some cuts of 70 feet would have to be made. Everyone knows that when filling of so great an amount is required, it is impossible to erect heavy structures on the filled land a month after the fills are made. In this case, very heavy structures would be required for the jet commercial planes which are to operate at the new field.

Mr. President, what has especially demonstrated a lack of consideration on the part of the attitude of the CAA has been the fact that shortly after the authority was given, in 1950, rumors of the use of commercial jet planes had begun to be heard; and for the past 2 or 3 years everyone has known, and the CAA has been frank to recognize, that the new airport is to be built to serve commercial jet planes from all over the Nation and elsewhere. That not only involves difficulties because of heavier structures, but it also involves threats of much greater noise. In view of the present state of knowledge, to locate an airport using jet planes in the vicinity of the residences of citizens who object to it—and who in the early years, at least, were not even allowed to appear at a hearing in that connection—to my mind would be the very height of lack of consideration, and even positive discourtesy. That is exactly what happened in the case of

the Fairfax officials. The members of the school board feel that way; the members of the planning board feel that way.

We would not be so concerned if they merely felt that way; but when they feel that way for good reasons, I wish to say we were concerned; and all the members of our special subcommittee, and later all the members of the full committee who heard the case, felt that a study by a completely new authority was required.

I see my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], now on the floor. I wish to pay him credit for having recommended the solution which now is submitted in connection with the proposed handling of this matter. He knew about the creation of the new board, because the matter had been handled by him in his committee. He suggested that as a brand new voice and a highly-trained voice in connection with two problems which are of primary concern in this case—namely, safety, and also the question of adjustment of flying patterns, the latter being closely connected to safety—this board, which was set up for the exact purpose of doing jobs of that sort, be used. I wish to have printed at this point in the RECORD the comment the distinguished Senator from Washington made about this matter, as his remarks appear in the hearings before the full Appropriations Committee; I refer to the portion of the additional hearings beginning at the bottom of page 2, and ending at the top of page 3. I ask unanimous consent that that excerpt from the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MAGNUSON. They are set up to explore and to assist the executive departments on all phases of the problem of airspace, air-navigational aids, and all matters pertaining to our rapidly crowding air condition in the United States.

There is pretty broad authority with respect to all of these problems, and, as you probably know by now, their first job would be—and the President is using his own funds until we appropriate money next January—as of now, to busily engage themselves in air-navigation matters; but you make recommendations as to airports, as to the whole problem of airspace and the crowded conditions and the safety in the air.

Mr. HOLLAND. In that statement the distinguished Senator from Washington, who is the chairman of the legislative committee concerned with this matter, made it very clear that he felt this was the proper way to handle this problem, and also that there was, under the measure establishing the new Board, specific authority for doing this kind of job. I shall not read the statement at this time, but, as a result of the request I have just made, Senators will find the statement in the RECORD.

Next, Mr. President, we have the effort to bring the State of Virginia into this matter—an effort not initiated here, but initiated by the State of Virginia itself. Virginia set up, some time ago, a study

commission in this field. The chairman is, I believe, the distinguished State Senator Fenwick, from the adjoining county of Arlington. He appeared before our committee, and testified. He said his group was holding hearings at that time; and he said he felt sure they would recommend that the State establish at its next session, next January, a State airport authority to help carry out the necessary objectives, just as groups of citizens elsewhere in the Nation have to do.

As a matter of fact, the number of people living outside the District of Columbia, in this great metropolitan area, now largely exceed in total the number who live within the District of Columbia. My recollection is that slightly less than 500,000 persons live in the adjoining counties of Virginia, and slightly more than 500,000 persons live in Montgomery County and Prince Georges County, Md. So far as Virginia is concerned—and, of course, it is natural for the residents of this part of Virginia to be interested—their interest in the matter has been manifested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield with pleasure to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. First, let me say that the Senator from Massachusetts is the one who took the bull by the horns and asked that General Quesada testify before our committee. I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts discussed the matter with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who likewise had discussed it with me. I desire to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for searching for a reasonable solution, one which would give everyone concerned a chance to be heard, and would give the Senate and the House of Representatives some assurance, when they acted, as I believe they will, in January, that they were following the correct course.

At this time I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Florida for the statement he has made.

I wish to say that in the full committees—I was not a member of the subcommittee—what impressed me involved three factors:

First, the question in connection with the use of the airfield by jet planes of greater speed, and the question, in that connection, whether the site at Burke was too close to the National Airport.

Second, the fact that several Senators who are directly interested in this problem stated very flatly and clearly that they will be willing to act next January, when the Board's report will be made, and that they do not intend to request that there be a further postponement. They said they were willing to act at that time. I thought that was very impressive.

Third, inasmuch as there has been such a great difference of opinion, it would be well to have the judgment of General Quesada, who heads the new board, who is a man of great military and aviation experience, and a noted flier. He was one of the early fliers in

the Air Force. With him, there is to serve a representative of the military and a representative of the Department of Commerce. General Quesada is to preside. Thus, there will be an opportunity to correlate the military airfields in the vicinity—Bolling Field, Andrews Field, and the others—with the commercial airfields in the vicinity, such as the National Airport, Friendship Airport, and others. So the new group will make the decision, and it seems to me that the decision the group will make will be extremely helpful to the Congress.

Furthermore, at least one of the Senators directly involved has stated unequivocally that when the new Board's report is made, he will be prepared to act and to have a forward step taken. The committee has stated in its report—and this is the present sense of the committee, and the report was adopted unanimously by the committee—that it will act when the supplemental budget comes to Congress in January.

For those reasons, it seems to me that the report of the Appropriations Committee and its action in temporarily putting aside these funds and providing for the report constitute a wise forward step in the direction of the commencement, in January, of construction of the airport.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, not only do I agree with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but again I wish to express to him my appreciation for making the suggestion which received the uniform approval of the Appropriations Committee. Incidentally, at that time the number of members of the Appropriations Committee who were sitting in the hearing and were trying to work out a solution to the problem was greater than the number of Members of the Senate on the floor of the Senate at this time.

The problem has been a difficult one, and we have tried to move toward a solution.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from pages 4 and 5 of the report, constituting the portion bearing on this question.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 980) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER II. COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION
Construction and development, additional Washington airport

The evidence presented to the committee in the course of hearings on this matter clearly indicates that Washington National Airport airspace-congestion problems are in large part due to the proximity of military flying activities. In addition to the congestion created by flight activities at Andrews Air Force Base, Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station, and smaller installations at Quantico and Fort Belvoir, restrictions on airspace utilization are created by the Quantico gunnery and rocket range and the Dahlgren danger area.

Testimony discloses that the Burke site is 14½ miles from Washington National Airport. The Systems Engineering Team of the Office of Aviation Facilities Planning, the White House, in their plan for Modernization of the National System of Aviation Facilities dated May 6, 1957, recommend "spacing between airports * * *

on the order of 16 miles." The effect of the proximity of the Burke site to the Washington National Airport would, as stated in the CAA Technical Development Report No. 187 of November 1952, "interfere with the west holding stack presently adopted for Washington National Airport and will probably require that the Washington National Airport approach system revert back to a one-stack operation * * * this change would reduce the acceptance rate of the Washington National Airport somewhat * * *."

This would mean that under instrument flight rule operations that Washington National Airport operations would be reduced because operations would work through one, instead of the present two, stacking areas.

Opposition to the Burke site was strongly presented by members of the Fairfax County Board, school board officials, members of the county planning commission, the two Senators from the State of Virginia, and the Member of Congress representing the district. It is apparent that such opposition may stem in large part from the lack of consultation with the local authorities which was prescribed by section 2 of Public Law 762 of September 7, 1950. Such opposition stemmed also from the apparent effect of the selection of the site at Burke upon the developmental program of the county planning commission and other impact upon the community, particularly with respect to the jet noise factor. At the time of the authorization (1950) and subsequent site selection, propeller aircraft were contemplated using the facility; the present situation is one where the facility would be serving commercial jets, expected to be operating in the near future.

With respect to other nearby areas, such as Chantilly and adjacent areas of Loudoun County, there was little evidence of local opposition.

Just yesterday the President approved Public Law 133, the Airways Modernization Act of 1957, creating the Airways Modernization Board.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the amount of \$12,500,000 allowed by the House be eliminated from the bill and directs that the Airways Modernization Board study the terms of Public Law 762 of the 81st Congress and in furtherance of that study investigate and recommend to the Congress by January 15, 1958, a site (either entirely new or the remodeling of a present airport) that is in its opinion suitable for a new modern airport adequate of serving the metropolitan area of Washington.

It is the present sense of the committee that it will take appropriate steps to approve and commence the construction at a site for such an airport in the early months of 1958 as it recognizes the need for such an airport in the metropolitan area of Washington.

The committee urges the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration in considering how best to route air traffic safely and expeditiously in the metropolitan area of Washington to make the fullest possible use of the Friendship Airport, temporarily, and, if advisable after experience, permanently.

This action is without prejudice with respect to submission of a request in the second session of this Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should also like to state that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], has endeavored in every way within his power to get the governmental agencies involved to be cooperative and to move in connection with this matter. I believe it was last July that the Senator from Arizona addressed a letter to the CAB

and the Department of Commerce. Incidentally, the Department of Commerce had, before that time, already made a formal request of the CAB. In the letter, the Senator from Arizona stated that the Senate Appropriations Committee believed it was entitled to have a trial made of Friendship Airport, because Friendship Airport has been built for the jet age, and is closer to the Nation's Capital than some other airfields are to the metropolitan centers they serve.

A strong demand for the use of Friendship Airport was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. Incidentally, both of them have been very helpful, but particularly the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], because of his membership on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has been exceedingly active in trying to bring this matter to a correct solution.

The two Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] have also been very active and helpful, particularly the junior Senator from Virginia, by reason of his membership on the Appropriations Committee. There has been no lack of cooperation there. There has been no lack of desire to find an answer. We have felt we were within our rights in seeking information as to what would happen when heavy movements of aircraft were diverted to Friendship, and we felt that the failure of both CAA and CAB, and the airlines, too, to make any movement in that direction has been recalcitrance and everything else but cooperation.

More than a year ago the CAB started hearings on this matter. I am now informed by the Chairman of the CAB that they have had their pre-prehearings and their prehearings. I have used the words to describe what they seemed to mean, from my standpoint, although they do not use those words. They expect to have a verdict by next June if they have good luck.

That is the kind of cooperation we have had from that source, and personally, I do not appreciate it. I think when the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, passing on an important matter to the Senate and to the Nation, makes a request of that kind, he is entitled to better cooperation than he has received. We are not talking about a few nickels. We are talking about construction which CAA has estimated will cost \$50 million. If it is as wrong on this estimate as it has been on other matters before the subcommittee, the cost will be nearer \$75 million, which is the estimate stated by a distinguished Virginia contractor, who has been brought into the picture by the two Virginia Senators.

Mr. President, we have been fighting in the Senate on a two or three million dollar item, represented by the difference between the commitment of the United States to the District of Columbia and the amount the Senate finally approved. That is chicken feed compared to what we are talking about now—an expenditure of somewhere between \$50 million and \$75 million. We are talking about doing something wholly

at Federal expense, for the benefit of a community in which live between four and five hundred thousand people, and for the benefit of a metropolitan area in which more persons live outside the District of Columbia than live in it. I feel on that ground we are entitled to insist, as we do in this report, that there be a trial made so we will have a chance to see what will happen.

Mr. President, there has been a very brief trial, because a few weeks ago when there was repair needed on a runway at the National Airport, a few flights had to be moved to Friendship. They brought those flights back just as quickly as they could. I do not know why, but I "suspected," if I may use that word, that the experiment pleased the flying public and the flying personnel too well. A week later I flew back from Florida and talked to two pilots on the plane. They told me they would much prefer to use Friendship, because of the simplicity of its approach procedures. They hoped we could work out an arrangement to make greater use of that airport.

Mr. President, we went further, and requested that the airlines make an analysis of their ticket sales. We found 5 of them in a 1-month period had sold 3,500 tickets to Baltimore residents, who came all the way from Baltimore to the National Airport to catch planes here. It is reasonable to assume that there was a similar number going back the other way. When one flies into the New York area he is always asked which area he would like to go to, and has a choice between various fields. There has been no such practice in this area. There has been no effort at all to refine the service here, at the only place in the Nation where the Federal Government has built, at its sole expense, the only airport, and which is now studying building another one.

The airlines are my friends. I trust them with my life about every weekend. But they have been less than frank. I would be less than candid if I did not say so. I think they can be cooperative, not to their hurt, but to aid the solution of this problem.

This year, when we are trying to be economical, are we to assume an additional Federal expense of from \$50 million to \$75 million, to provide the entire cost of constructing a second airport for this metropolitan area? It is a disturbing question, at least to me.

The Airways Modernization Board has been brought into the debate. I am one of the Senators who stated I thought we ought to bring this dispute to an end; that if the Board made a real study of it and made a recommendation, so far as I was concerned I was through fighting. I do not object to fighting, but I like to have a more definite stake involved than one of this kind.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is now presiding so graciously, as he always does, is one who made the same statement. If the action proposed by the Committee is taken, we have the assurance of early action next January. I do not know what the recommendation of the Board will be. I hope it will not come back with another

recommendation for Burke, because the facts are against it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the Senator of the opinion that if the Airways Modernization Board makes a recommendation and recommends Burke, it will end the controversy, and that the CAA can go forward with building the airport at Burke, or will it lead to further delay?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it will end the matter. It will so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned. As my colleague well knows, we have enough matters to look after in Florida, growing as it is, to require all the attention we can afford apart from general national and international matters. This has been a real burden, which the Senator from Florida did not ask for, but one of which he has had to bear a good part. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to go along with any recommendation that may be made.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am, of course, very well satisfied with any statement my colleague makes to that effect. I wondered if in discussions in the Appropriations Committee, where the junior Senator from Virginia and other Senators were present, it was their judgment that when the Airways Modernization Board made its recommendations that would finally end the matter, and there would then thereafter not have to be another committee created to study the matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought this was the committee to end all committees, but I would prefer my distinguished friend from Virginia to answer that question, if he cares to do so, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the committee was almost unanimous in wanting a board that was not dominated by travel time to take a look at this situation, because we had 300 pages showing that Burke was not the best site. We did not think the CAA had given a fair and impartial study to what was involved. We considered that we started out with a \$14 million project. We did not have the additional language contained in a previous bill which provided that from year to year Congress could appropriate for improvements and developments and that the building of a \$75 million airport could be started. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 is that in the second paragraph of the act of 1950, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out, it was provided that the CAA, which had the power to select the site, should consult with the local authorities. The CAA did not do it. It met at 8 o'clock one night, and between that time and 9 o'clock it decided the site was going to be Burke.

The committee was of the unanimous opinion that it wanted an independent agency to study the matter before Congress committed itself to an expenditure of \$75 million.

The local authorities have made it plain that Burke would be the worst possible site. However, the fact remains that the law of 1950 provided that the CAA has the authority to select the site.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The report of the committee is not law. The report is an indication that Congress wants an independent agency to look into this matter. We believe if the CAA agrees with the recommendation of the independent agency, it will not delay the matter; but if the CAA is obstinate and says, "We do not care what you say about it. We are the ones to make the decision. We decided back in 1950 that it should be Burke, and we are still in favor of Burke. That is what we want—where we want the new airport." An amendment offered to that effect would be legislation, and I will make a point of order when the Senator offers such an amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield so that I may respond to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was not offering an amendment, but the question had arisen whether, if the Airways Modernization Board made a recommendation and made one other than Burke, but the CAA, having final authority, which the Senator from Virginia agrees it has, did not go along with the Airways Modernization Board, would we not be right back to the point where we are at this moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. Congress is still supreme. Congress can still legislate. If Congress wants a site other than Burke, Congress can say, "On all the facts and circumstances, we now legislate for some other site," and that would settle it.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator would have Congress exercise its judgment over that of the CAA with respect to where the airport should be?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. As a matter of fact, the CAA will have one of its officials as 1 of the 3 members of the Board, because the Secretary of Commerce would appoint 1 member of the Board. The Secretary of Defense would appoint one member of the Board, and, of course, he would say we cannot take Andrews Field or Bolling Field. The CAA would say Chantilly is too far away. The other members of the Board would beat on General Quesada's neck. Does the Senator appreciate that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am somewhat confused as to what the response of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia was to the question asked by the Senator from Florida. I should like to rephrase it with relation to one possible development. Suppose the Airways Modernization Board recommends Burke, and suppose the CAA recommendation coincides with the decision on Burke. Will that end the struggle, or will the Senator from Virginia and his group continue to oppose it? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia would have to say that no matter how many Quesadas and boards should favor Burke, he thinks

they would be wrong, but he does not say he would keep on fighting, because he knows when he is licked.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] may I say that my answer to my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida, was for myself only. I also stated that I knew how various other Senators felt, including the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I believe the Senator from Michigan was in that category. The Senator will speak for himself, since he is present in the Chamber.

The Senator from Mississippi and various other Senators made it clear that they thought this matter should be brought to an end. As a matter of fact, though I do not mean to quote any other Senator, I think the Senator from Mississippi was probably among the first in our special subcommittee to come to the opinion that the Burke site was not a wise site, and submitted in place thereof the name of Chantilly. I believe the Senator was the first to approach me on that subject.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

If I may address the junior Senator from Virginia, what appealed to me very much with reference to the decision of the committee was a very important paragraph which we find in the report. The Senator from Virginia was present. I should like to have his comment on the matter, because I think one of the things which as I say, convinced me that the action of the committee was appropriate, was the statement in these lines:

It is the present sense of the committee that it will take appropriate steps to approve and commence the construction at a site for such an airport in the early months of 1958 as it recognizes the need for such an airport in the metropolitan area of Washington.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia was present. His distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, said, "I am satisfied we need another airport." And the Senator from Virginia said, "I agree." The Senator from Mississippi said, "I am satisfied it is going to have to be somewhere in Virginia, but not necessarily at Burke." And the Senator from Mississippi further said, "Would the Senator from Virginia object to our putting in the report a statement that next year, early in January, we are going to act?" And the Senator from Virginia said, "No. That is the proper thing to do."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Senator from Virginia went one step further, did he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; he did. He said that the Senators from Virginia were not opposing the location of an airport in their home State, but that they did not think Burke was the best site, and they wanted an independent judgment on that one point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And when the decision is made with reference to a site,

though the Senator from Virginia did not commit himself finally to the site, he certainly said he would be very much influenced by the decision, did he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. He would have to admit that that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make one further comment for the RECORD.

Soon after the distinguished Senator from Mississippi made the suggestion to me that he thought Chantilly should be carefully studied, I got in touch with the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and asked that he do exactly that. I will say, in justice to the Administrator, that at that time he had to leave on a long vacation, which was the first he had had a chance to take in a long while.

The point I make now, Mr. President, is that despite my keen anticipation and long waiting and urgent request, I received no reply about the advantages of Chantilly and its qualifications as a site until after the supplemental budget item had come to the Senate and after the hearings had been set by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the committee.

I should like to read the four "findings" sentences. Any Senator who wishes to may see the entire letter, which includes many references to charts and data. I do not want to include the whole letter in the RECORD.

There are a few paragraphs of interest:

Actually, it seems to us that any comparison of the two sites—

This is a quotation from the letter of the Administrator of the CAA, with reference to the two sites of Burke and Chantilly:

Actually, it seems to us that any comparison of the two sites should emphasize four things that we do know something about: (a) accessibility; (b) soil conditions; (c) air traffic control; and (d) relative cost. Our discussion of those four factors follows. Briefly summarized, our findings are these:

(a) Burke is more accessible to Washington National and to the District of Columbia than is Chantilly.

(b) Although more material would have to be moved in the process of grading the Burke site, it is softer, easier and cheaper than would be the excavation and grading work in connection with the Chantilly site.

The reference there means cheaper per unit, Mr. President, but by no means cheaper in totality, because at Burke 16 million yards would have to be moved and at Chantilly only 5½ million yards, and that on a rock base. Chantilly has a much more level site, and does not have present some very soft and unwanted types of earth found at Burke.

Mr. SMATHERS. The letter comes from whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. From the Administrator of the CAA. The Senator may see it if he wishes. As a matter of fact, I would put the letter in the RECORD were it not for the fact that so much is keyed to the maps and charts which accompany it that it would be impossible of understanding.

I hope Senators will listen to the next item particularly:

(c) Air traffic controlwise, satisfactory patterns and procedures can be worked out for either Burke or Chantilly, with Chantilly offering somewhat better possibilities than Burke.

(d) Ultimate costs would be approximately equal for constructing an airport at Burke or at Chantilly.

As to the last item, item (d), that is the only statement of that kind we have been able to find from any source. To the contrary, the contractor and the earth mover and others who were before the committee all said that the construction cost at Burke would be a great deal larger because of the immense earth-moving figures which were involved.

Mr. President, that is the gist of the proposal. Burke has a little advantage distancewise, Chantilly has an advantage—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Moneywise.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Mexico is ahead of me. I was going to say, first, it had an advantage air-pattern-wise. That is shown in the first report, away back in 1950. Chantilly was shown to be preferable to Burke from the standpoint of air pattern, because it is farther away from Washington National Airport.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that if Burke is selected, in order to make the airport possible at that site there are places where the engineers will have to dig 70 feet and places where they will have to fill 70 feet?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At Chantilly, while it would take 7 minutes longer to get to the city of Washington, the Government would save millions of dollars by reason of the terrain, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct?

Mr. President, I should like to close on this matter. I hope this will be the last time I shall ever have to debate on the Senate floor the airport situation of Washington, because it has been an onerous duty.

I regret that the subcommittee was not able to file a full and firm report. The situation was this: Two of us felt one way about it; two of us felt another way about it; and one felt still a third way.

Mr. President, the situation was clearly disclosed to the full committee and clearly discussed by all of us at that time, and the full committee knew what the situation was. I do not think it would be profitable to discuss that matter now.

Mr. President, there is no question at all that this problem can be solved through the means we have suggested. Nor is there any question at all that the situation is being eased in a small degree by the doing of things which our subcommittee got started, or which our able chairman for the full committee got started, such as the moving of MATS

from the Washington National Airport. MATS has entirely moved now, except for 156 operations per year, which they are in the process of moving. I believe that move will be completed by November of this year, according to reports from the Department of Commerce.

In the case of Bolling, there is a move underway. As to the use of space by MATS, they have been able to turn back to the airport, for parking and for other uses, 2 or 3 acres of land which they had earlier occupied.

There are many different kinds of partial solutions which are underway. None of them is adequate, but they all seek to give a more convenient operation and seek to carry out an objective which I think my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, will agree with me is one of the principal objectives, and that is to make National Airport, which should always be regarded as the most convenient and the most accessible, serve the maximum safe traffic load that it can serve from time to time.

With reference to Friendship, there has been complete recalcitrance up to now. We hope some data will be made available this fall. Perhaps this approach will not work. If it does, not work at least we will know that, if a real trial is made in the months to come.

Mr. President, I should dislike to think that we would not differentiate between a community which has done its full bit for itself, with relation to its airport, under national legislation, and the other adjoining areas to Washington, where up to now there has been no evidence of willingness to rise to community responsibility.

Mr. President, that about concludes my remarks. I am sorry they were as lengthy as they were, but it seemed necessary to discuss the question in some detail. I think the two Senators from Virginia, and the Representative in Congress from that district of Virginia, all of whom I see in the Chamber, are thoroughly within their rights, as are the members of the board of supervisors of Fairfax County, their planning board, and other school board officials, in taking the position they take.

One thing I have not mentioned is that a new school is directly on the line of the proposed Burke Airport, and would have to be eliminated at Federal expense if that proposal went through.

The other main line of flight goes directly over Fairfax High School and courthouse, and the business and residential sections, at a distance of some 3½ miles from the end of the protected area just beyond the runway.

I do not believe that that sort of thing should be visited upon a community of many thousands of people, with thousands of schoolchildren being adversely affected. It seems to me that we should move to allow the Board to consider all the factors affecting those good people, and submit to us a recommendation based upon proper consideration of all the factors involved.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Florida for the very fine hearings he conducted on this subject, and the very thorough way he went into it.

As a member of the specially appointed subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this question, let me add one word, for whatever it may contribute to some progress on this matter.

This was more or less a new subject to me when we held the hearings, but I was quickly convinced that Washington must have an additional major airport, especially to take care of jet commercial planes, and that the additional airport is necessary notwithstanding the fact that Friendship Airport may be used to a considerably great extent than at present.

At all events, I think the logical location would be in northern Virginia. After riding over the Burke territory, however, and studying the area, I was convinced that further consideration should be given to the Chantilly area. So, notwithstanding the fact that I thought we were "burning daylight" and should proceed to meet the situation, I withheld my vote in favor of the Burke site until something further can be learned about Chantilly.

The other day one of the witnesses before the committee said that Chantilly was a suitable location, but that he thought Burke was a better location. That certainly shows that both of them are at least suitable. I am glad to see the study started, and I urged the full committee to put positive language in the report indicating progress. I think there will be action by the committee in the early part of 1958.

I trust that we shall have a clear-cut recommendation on our table when we return in January. I am confident that the committee will speedily act thereon. Like the chairman, I am inclined to favor the Chantilly site. I certainly would like to see further consideration given the subject. I believe, following the submission of the report of the commission, that the airport can be started.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH], who is the ranking minority member on our subcommittee, missed no sessions of the hearings, and evinced a very active interest in the problem. I believe she has just left the Chamber. I believe that her preferences in the matter, if anything, were stronger than those of the senior Senator from Florida. Inasmuch as she is not present, I shall say only this much: She felt that we were not being treated fairly, either by Government agencies or the airlines, and that a much more reasonable handling of this problem was required before the go ahead signal was given and the commitment to spend this huge sum was made.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike from the bill the item for an additional Washington

airport, beginning with line 13 on page 2.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. If a Senator desires to vote for the Burke site, he should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. A vote of "yea" would be a vote to strike the item for the additional airport.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike from the bill the item for an additional Washington airport, beginning on page 2, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think there is one item which we should scrutinize very carefully. I refer to the item beginning in line 21 on page 29, and extending to line 5 on page 30, appropriating \$1 million for new furniture for the new Senate Office Building.

I spoke briefly on this subject some weeks ago. I think it should be gone into very carefully. I appreciate the fine character of the members of the Senate Commission charged with this duty, and the fine work of the Senate Appropriations Committee. But there are grave possibilities that we shall subject ourselves to criticism if we appropriate \$1 million for furniture in the new building.

I want to point out, in the first place, that every Senator already has a desk and equipment. Every clerk has a desk and equipment. There is an ample supply of typewriters. What the new building provides is space; but we do not need new furniture to fill that space. If additional furniture is needed, it seems to me that probably there is used furniture in the possession of the General Services Administration lying around Washington that could be used. To provide another \$1 million would mean that we would be giving each of the 40 or 50 Senators who will move into the new building \$20,000 to \$25,000 to equip his office, and also to provide for the new hearing rooms when, as a matter of fact, Senators already have equipment and furniture which could be moved in. So personally I shall vote against this committee amendment, and I hope that it may be voted down. If it is voted down, I think perhaps we can propose an amendment to make the amount \$500,000, or such smaller sum as the committee may desire. But I warn Members of this body most solemnly we shall be exposing ourselves to grave criticism if we appropriate an additional \$1 million for new furniture, when the furniture we already have in our offices is, for all practical purposes, adequate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no one respects the Senator from Illinois more than I do. I like his sincerity of purpose. But Congress has taken action. It passed a bill to finish construction of the new Senate Office Building. It passed a bill to refurbish the old Senate Office Building. I, as chairman of the commission for the Senate, am trying

only to carry out my duties under those two measures.

It is true that we could move furniture from the old Senate Office Building to the New Senate Office Building; but every time we take old furniture from the old Senate Office Building, it will have to be replaced.

No one wishes to waste a single penny. It is true that there is furniture in the old Senate Office Building which could be moved to the new Senate Office Building. I hope my good friend the Senator from Illinois will go to the new Senate Office Building, and if he wishes to take his furniture with him, we shall try to make it available to him at any time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator mentioned my name.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I mentioned the name of the Senator, but he mentioned my name before that. Let the Senator be patient.

If we take the furniture from the old Senate Office Building—and I hope my good friend from Illinois—no names mentioned—will go to the new Senate Office Building and take his furniture with him—it will be in accordance with the wishes of Senators. As chairman of the Building Commission of the Senate, I have written a letter to every Senator concerned asking whether or not he wished to take his present furniture with him. If so, well and good.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry, but I did not yield to the Senator from Illinois—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was going to try to help the Senator a little.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I do not need any help. Inasmuch as I did not yield to the Senator from Illinois, I must decline to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

We are going to help Senators take their furniture when they move to the new Senate Office Building. I wrote a letter to every Senator—94 besides myself—asking if they wanted to keep their own furniture. If they want it, they can keep it. But, after all, we do have a responsibility. Why should I take a beating on furnishing the new Senate Office Building? In the Old Office Building possibly 45 Senators will remain, and the others will go to the new building. What are we going to do? Are we going to leave unfurnished rooms? Is it the responsibility of those who have been authorized to do something about it, to take care of the matter? Are we going to do it, or not?

I am sending to the desk an amendment with reference to what we have been authorized to do. We have authorized by law that at least five rooms shall be provided for each and every Senator in the Old Senate Office Building. We are trying to comply with that authorization of the law.

Accordingly, the Architect of the Capitol, who is the authorized agent of the Senate in matters of this nature, has been directed to provide five rooms for each Senator who remains in the old Senate Office Building.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 15, after the colon, it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning with the word "Provided" and ending on line 20 with the word "Capitol" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated may be expended only for such work as can be done by the force of the Architect of the Capitol, except that not to exceed \$20,000 of such funds may be expended on a personal service contract basis for consulting architectural and engineering services for preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost heretofore completed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On August 16 the Architect of the Capitol addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It reads, in part, as follows:

AUGUST 16, 1957.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The supplemental appropriation bill, 1958, H. R. 9131, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations on August 15, 1957, contains the following item:

"Remodeling, Senate Office Building: Toward carrying out the provisions of the act of July 10, 1957 (Public Law 85-95, 85th Cong.), authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate, \$250,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated may be expended only for such work as can be done by the force of the Architect of the Capitol and that no part of such funds may be expended for planning by architects or engineers not on the staff of the Architect of the Capitol."

The Senator from Arizona may wish to make a statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Some consulting architects must be engaged. That is why the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico proposes to take \$20,000 of the \$250,000 for consulting architects. It is a proper amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that what the Senator from New Mexico is proposing is to the committee amendment on page 30, lines 15 to 20?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is to strike out the proviso on page 30, line 15, reading:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated may be expended only for such work as can be done by the force of the Architect of the Capitol and that no part of such funds may be expended for planning by architects or engineers not on the staff of the Architect of the Capitol.

And insert language in lieu thereof.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If that amendment is adopted, does it mean that the whole amendment, beginning on line 21, page 29, to line 20, page 30, will be adopted?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it is an amendment to a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the committee amendments have been agreed to en bloc, including the amendment beginning at line 21, page 29, with the right given to any Senator to offer amendments to the ones adopted en bloc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Am I to understand that we have already approved an appropriation of \$1 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is subject to the right of any Senator to amend it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to strike out the figure of \$1 million on line 4 of page 30 and to insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I see it, there is no objection to adopting the \$20,000 amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I would suggest that the Senate take action on that amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I note that the Senator is limiting the use of that money with respect to the payment of architects who are—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Employees of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He is limiting the money to payment of architects who are now employees of the Senate. Did the Senator come to that conclusion because of what he believes to be the inordinate charges made by outside architects?

Mr. CHAVEZ. With regard to inordinate charges, I should like to tell the Senator that the Commission, of which I am a member, has in its membership also the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. They passed on this subject matter, and they are not scared by any newspaper stories. We are not buying an \$800 stepladder for the Senator from Ohio; nothing at all like that. We are not going to buy him an \$800 desk.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of putting the question is gathered from page 382 of the hearings, where it is shown that in the building of structures for the Air Force Academy architects will be paid \$8,900,000 on an anticipated expenditure of \$118 million, and that that \$8,900,000 in architects' fees is predicated upon a 6-percent fee for plans and specifications and a 3-percent fee for inspection.

My inquiry is whether the limitation on the use of the fund for architects engaged is the consequence of the belief that in the hiring of outside architects the fees charged are greater than justified.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to say to my good friend from Ohio that that was not the reason, but it could be a good reason. By the grace of the United States Senate, I happen to be a member of the Board of Visitors from the Senate to the Air Force Academy. Some of the fees the Senator talks about now—

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me tell the Senator this: It was American business at its best, and they put it over.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Mexico developed this thought in his questions during the hearings. He put certain questions about architects' fees, and from those questions I gathered that he was dissatisfied with what was being done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We were dissatisfied with what the architects were getting. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy. We did not like the fees. However, there were Philadelphia architects involved. [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations who heard the testimony, that the \$20,000 was decided on for this reason:

The original amendment called for approximately \$500,000 for the architect's plans and specifications, to remodel the old Senate Office Building—the one now in use—at an expense of approximately \$7,250,000.

The committee felt that it did not want to begin with any such expensive plans at this time. So the committee said it would stop that planning, and would appropriate \$250,000 for the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Stewart, and his assistants, so they could arrange to have the doors cut and to have the plumbing adjusted properly, and so forth, as may be necessary. But there will be no plans to put the wiring underground, install new lighting, and so forth.

The situation is that the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Stewart, had spent \$20,000 in drawing up the plans and specifications. Ultimately, when we decide to remodel the old Senate Office Building, those plans and specifications, which by then will have been paid for, will be of value. But if the item of \$500,000 for plans is eliminated, the Architect will have no means with which to pay for the work which already has been done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the reason for the \$20,000. In that way, we shall purchase the plans which will be used when we decide to remodel the old Senate Office Building.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Furthermore, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that although it is perfectly proper for him to object, yet he must realize that when the Senate and the House of Representatives pass a bill placing on the Senate Office Building Commission the responsibility of re-

furbishing the old Senate Office Building, that responsibility is not easy to meet.

Furthermore, it is more expensive to remodel an old building than it is to construct a new one.

I do not know on what floor or on what side of the old Senate Office Building the office of the Senator from Ohio is located. But I point out to him that the original building had only three sides; those on Constitution Avenue—then called B Street—and on C Street and on Delaware Avenue. The side on First Street was built only a few years ago. The original part of the Senate Office Building is approximately 45 years old; and the plumbing, the electrical equipment, the wiring, and so forth, have deteriorated greatly. That situation is what causes the work to be so costly. Certainly no one wishes to waste \$7 million or \$8 million.

Furthermore, I wish the Senate to realize that although the Congress has been perfectly willing to appropriate approximately \$28 million for the Department of Justice, on Pennsylvania Avenue, but when there is a question of providing for the necessary offices for Senators, there seems to be objection. Yet many Senators constantly complain about the lack of room. They need sufficient room in which to be able to interview their constituents, and so forth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am not objecting to this proposal. I think a reading of the questions put by the distinguished Senator will clearly indicate that it is his impression that in the case of some of the proposals and some of the costs—especially in the case of the Air Force Academy—he is not in agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. For instance, I do not like the chapel.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall discuss that subject later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I handled the last bill for the Department of Defense; it involved approximately \$34,500,000,000. By the time the items for military construction are included, the total will be approximately \$38 billion. It is not easy to deal with such items, and the Senator will be surprised at the amount of waste involved. We are trying to do something about that, because the total is too large.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to make a reduction in the amendment voted by the Appropriations Committee, which calls for an appropriation of \$1 million.

Mr. President, \$1,350,000 was requested for furniture for the new Senate Office Building. The Appropriations Committee voted to reduce that to \$1 million. That amount will not necessarily have to be spent; it is appropriated for the Senate Office Building Commission to use as it sees fit in purchasing whatever furniture may be needed.

In this connection the report provides as follows, with reference to competitive bidding:

In this connection the committee requests the Senate Office Building Commission to get competitive bids for the furniture and furnishings insofar as competitive bidding is

practicable. When it is not practical, then the committee urges the Commission to follow the purchases with utmost care. It also believes that careful thought must be given to the extent it is possible to use furniture from the present Senate Office Building in order to have the best possible equipment for both buildings when they are fully equipped and in use.

That spells out the matter in considerable detail—in fact, in more detail than the authorization act itself did.

When the building is completed, there will be 315 empty rooms—without Venetian blinds, shade, draperies, floor coverings, or furniture. All of us realize that to purchase the furnishings for a room in a residence will cost at least several hundred dollars, and perhaps \$1,000. In this case there will be 315 rooms, 10 of which will be large committee rooms, large enough to accommodate witnesses, committee staffs, and Senators. Of course, all that will involve considerable expenditures. Some of the pieces of furniture will have to be made especially for that purpose. So we do not know what the actual cost will be. But we know the new building is needed, and we know it will have 315 rooms, which will have to be equipped with furniture. We have proposed this appropriation for the discretionary use of the Commission, which is composed of Senators, who will use the appropriation under the provisions of the authorization act. Furthermore, we have called for competitive bidding.

Of course, I hope that nowhere near \$1 million will be required. But I may say that the subcommittee dealing with this matter voted to eliminate all funds except those which it thought were probably essential, for items which should be appropriated for now, so the work can be done with dispatch.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORRISON in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. DOUGLAS. That amendment calls for striking out the proviso now appearing on page 30, between lines 15 and 20, and inserting a new proviso; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it possible to combine two motions—namely, a motion to reconsider the vote by which one of the committee amendments was agreed to and a motion to strike out the figure

“\$1,000,000”, on page 30, in line 4, and to substitute for it “\$500,000”?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is not necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have a ruling from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it is not necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. HAYDEN. When we requested that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, it was clearly understood that it would not be necessary for a Senator to move to reconsider, if he wished to offer an amendment to one of the committee amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to be assured to that effect. I had understood that the ruling of the Chair was to the contrary; namely, that, after the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, a motion to reconsider would be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not intend to give that impression to the Senator from Illinois. The committee amendments were adopted en bloc with the understanding that they were open to amendment by any Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad of that.

Then, Mr. President, I move that on page 30, in line 4, the figure “\$1,000,000” be stricken out, and that there be inserted, in lieu thereof, the figure “\$500,000.”

I should like to speak briefly to that amendment.

Mr. President, I know it seems very ungracious—after the hard and good work done by the committee which has dealt with the new office building and after the fine work done by the Appropriations Committee—to propose that this item be cut in half. I hope my good friends will not regard my motion as in any respect an indication of a lack of confidence in them. Again and again, both on the floor of the Senate and off it, I have paid tribute to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], whom I believe to be one of the finest men who has ever served in this body. I stand by everything I have said about him; and my opinion of the other Senators is equally as high.

However, I desire to point out that, although it is true that there are to be 315 new rooms, there will not be any new Senators. There will still be 96 Senators; and each Senator and the members of his staff already have desks, tables, and so forth. What we lack is space.

I have been in the offices of a number of other Senators. At this time I refer particularly to the offices of Senators who represent large States, and some of whom do not have great seniority. I have seen the way in which their office forces are crowded into three-room suites. For instance, I have been in the offices of the two Senators from New York. As I recall, Senator Lehman, of New York, used to have only four rooms. I realize that the New York Senators receive more correspondence than do any other Senators. Yet, in the rooms of the Senators from New York, the desks

were placed back to back; and, as I recall, one Senator from New York used to receive approximately 2,000 letters a day. So what we need is more space.

I have been very dubious about having a new Senate Office Building. I do not think I voted for it. On one occasion I voted against it. When it went through, I did not vote for it. But that is water over the dam. The new building will permit a broadening out and the giving of more space to Senators, particularly those from the heavily populated States. However, the point I am trying to make is that Senators do not need proportionately more furniture. The furniture is already here. If more is needed, I think it can be found in the warehouses around Washington, in the possession of the General Services Administration.

I am not going to pose in any holier-than-thou attitude, but since the Senator from New Mexico made certain references to me, I may say I do not wish to move into the new office building. I do not wish any new furniture. We will make the existing furniture do. If necessary, we will pitch in and do any painting job that is required. I do not want even a new wastepaper basket from the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to continue. The Senator from New Mexico did not yield to me. May I continue?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator may.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that we operate in a goldfish bowl, and in a sense it is very good that we should. Our expenditures are subject to very close scrutiny, and it is necessary that we not only be above reproach, but that, like Caesar's wife, we should seem to be above reproach. Mistakes which can be made in good faith will rebound and hurt the reputation of the entire Senate. I do not say mistakes will necessarily be made, but there is the opportunity for them.

Personally, I do not think it should be at the option of the individual Senator as to whether he wants completely new furniture. That apparently, at present, is the situation. I personally do not want any new furniture. There have been other Senators, I am sure, who have taken the same position. Now, however, if a Senator demands furniture, it is proposed to provide him with it. No one knows quite what the cost will be. I do not think this should be a matter for individual option. I think we should wear out what we have. I am not a great admirer of Calvin Coolidge, but his maxim of “make things do and wear them out” is much better than scrapping good furniture and getting new furniture.

Mr. President, I am not going to labor this matter, because to seem to be in favor of economy places one in a grudging position. To be an economizer puts one at the bottom of the totem pole, and he is actually regarded as questioning the good faith of his colleagues when he wants to cut down on the funds devoted to the running of the Senate. I do not want to overemphasize the importance

of this item, but at least I think we should be extremely careful about expenditures we make on ourselves, and I say that without reflecting on the committees of the Senate who have had this job.

Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I told the Senator from Illinois, there is no one who respects his judgment more than I do, and I heartily agree with him on the general matter of economy.

A few years ago there used to be a different ceiling in this Chamber. The ceiling was coming down. It had been in place for 96 years. In order to save a few thousand dollars, we had permitted the ceiling to deteriorate to the point where it could have come down on the head of the Senator from Minnesota or Illinois or New Mexico—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure we would have gotten a subscription if it had fallen on the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We could have saved a few thousand dollars by not doing anything about it, but it was economy to use a little money in order to fix the ceiling, and thereby possibly save millions of dollars in damage.

My friend from Illinois says he does not want to go into the new building. He does not have to. He can stay in the old building, and we can provide good space for him. Whether we like it or not, we enacted a law, and that law is still the law of the land. I refer to Public Law 85-95, 85th Congress, which was Senate bill 1429, and which provides for the remodeling of the Old Senate Office Building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say I am not raising a question about the remodeling of the old Senate Office Building? I congratulate the committee on eliminating an appropriation for \$7¼ million. I have not questioned the amendment the committee has proposed on that feature. What I am questioning is the appropriation of a million dollars for furniture for the new Senate Office Building.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before the Senator eliminates appropriations for the old Senate Office Building, would he mind providing for air conditioning in my office? I have been there 8 years, and the air conditioning system has not worked. I believe in economy, but I do not believe in it at the expense of seven persons who work in the back room of my office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that is why I am fighting for this appropriation. The plumbing in his building is 45 years old. The wiring in his building is old. It is a wonder there has not been a fire there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have had one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad I have never had a complaint—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Any employer in town who kept his employees in working conditions like those in some of these offices would be dragged before a judge and put in jail under some kind of con-

tempt proceedings. Inasmuch as the Senator says the building is going to be repaired, I wish he would see that some new wiring is put in my office. I have already blown out some fuses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I interrupt him—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield for a brief period.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will take it on my own time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address a question to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I listened to the general figures given by the Senator from Mississippi about the new rooms. Mr. Stewart testified that the cost of the furniture would be \$1,350,000. I am referring to page 873 of the hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 874 the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], asked whether that sum would cover all the furniture needed.

Mr. Stewart answered that it would.

Now, my question is, Does that contemplate buying new furniture for all Senators?

Mr. STENNIS. No, it does not. The general discussion was that every Senator who wanted to could have his old furniture transferred to the new building. There was further discussion and it was shown that there would not be enough of it. It was brought out that, with expansion and more rooms, there are more clerks, and more secretaries, and new furniture is required.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 873, the Senator from Louisiana asked the question:

What is the full amount?

Mr. STEWART. \$1,350,000.

Senator ELLENDER. Will that cover the entire cost of the furniture?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir, everything, provided we buy all new furniture.

I judge from that answer that the provision of \$1,350,000 contemplated the buying of all new furniture for every Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, we reduced that amount from \$1,350,000 to \$1,000,000; but it does not cover only furniture. That amount covers equipment, including equipment for a cafeteria. As we understood, all such equipment is included in that amount. Everything that will go into the new building, except the walls and windows, will be included in the general appropriation for furniture and fixtures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but I have—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I recapture the floor for a moment? May I say if it requires \$1,350,000 to buy new furniture for 96 Senators, and if we then appropriate \$1 million, it is obvious that we are expecting to have furniture bought for approximately three-quarters of the

Senate. I submit it simply is not needed. The new office building will provide more space, but it is not necessary that we junk three-quarters of the furniture we have and put in elaborate new equipment. There are still 96 Senators.

Even if Hawaii and Alaska should be admitted as States—as I hope they will be—that would merely add 4 percent to the number of Senators.

So far as I know, there is no added appropriation for staff. We shall have the same staffs, only they will not be packed close together as they are now.

There are no new committee staff appointees. We simply will get more breathing space, but we will not get more personnel.

It is not necessary to go through the elaborate process of buying new furniture when we already have decent furniture. I have been in the offices, probably, of half the Senators. I would not say that the furniture is rundown and excessively shabby. If it were shabby, that would be a mark of distinction rather than reproach.

I think the idea that public officials must have elaborate quarters and highly expensive furniture and expensive carpets is an abuse of the principle of democratic simplicity, which we should follow. The fact that we have allowed the departments downtown to go wild—and I have opposed those building appropriations—is no reason why we should go wild ourselves.

Mr. President, I do not wish to elaborate upon this point, because, as I say, it seems almost ungracious to stand up in this chamber and propose cheeseparing economies. It looks niggardly. It looks as though one is a bad sport. It looks as though one is self-righteous. One could make all kinds of reproaches against a person trying to save some money. I am aware of that.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, if we do not set an example ourselves, how can we control others? People will point the finger at us. I think there is a lot of military waste. When we go after military waste, if we have not eliminated our own waste, the people in the Pentagon can say, "Clean up your own house." I think there is a lot of waste downtown. Unless we manage to eliminate our own waste, the people downtown can say, "Reform yourselves first." That is a pretty good rule—reform yourself first.

I do not wish to elaborate upon this point. I merely make the motion and I ask to have it voted upon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois makes a very worthy point with reference to furniture. I would not wish to stand in opposition to that point. However, if this item includes the cafeteria, I want to say something about that.

I do not think United States Senators are entitled to luxury at all. I do not think very many people are entitled to luxury, unless they can afford it and earn it. But almost any form of life is entitled to a meal, and one is entitled to

eat in a reasonably wholesome surrounding.

I submit that the greatest waste of the public time and funds is represented by the hours spent on the part of high-priced officials of Government—United States Senators and Representatives in Congress—who are trying to find a place to eat. Hundreds of hours every day in this Capitol are wasted by officials who are paid \$22,500 a year, standing in line to get something to eat, as if they were in Moscow, queued up to get a yo-yo.

I want to take my time on this subject. This is a long-time gripe.

Even canines are entitled to the right to eat, but in this Capitol—mark my words—Members of the Senate stand with their families and stand with their constituents looking around, literally almost getting ready to bribe somebody, to get a place to eat, and when one does eat one is packed closer than Norwegian sardines in a Bolivian tin can.

I resent this as a human being. My resentment has nothing to do with being a public official. A taxpayer is entitled to more than that. If Senators do not have any more regard for themselves than that, and want to eat like that, that is fine, but they ought not make their constituents do so.

Furthermore, when one has to pay 75 cents for a hamburger, the restaurant ought to make some money from that sale. I do not like to hear about the cafeteria losing money. Anyone who cannot make money from a 75-cent hamburger has his hand in the register. It is utterly impossible not to make money from a 75-cent hamburger, particularly when the hamburger gets thinner and thinner every time the price goes up.

I am about to conclude this brief statement. I hope in this million dollars there is provision for some place for their constituents to get a wholesome meal, even if not for Senators. I hope it will be provided so that the waiters will not have to make a marathon run to deliver the dishes from the kitchen, which is off a block from the restaurant.

I am sure this is all provided for in the planning. If the \$1 million provides for a cafeteria, may I say that there will be rejoicing in heaven, for the privilege of citizens of the United States who come to the Capitol to have a place to eat, just a simple little place to eat.

This is not the most profound subject, but it does cause one to wonder after a while, when one takes his mother to have lunch and waits until Tuesday for the lunch ordered on Monday to be delivered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, is one of my dearest friends.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am with the Senator on the furniture side of the argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I like the Senator very much, and I do not wish to interfere with the insatiable pursuit of proteins by the Senator from Minnesota.

I am sure the new building will be equipped with a cafeteria, but I am talking about furniture. It is extraordinary that every time I start talking about furniture we drift into something else. We talk about the roof falling in, or we talk about standing in line to get into a restaurant, or we talk about ventilation.

What I am trying to say is that it is not necessary to spend a million dollars primarily for furniture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to say that in the million dollars was the amount necessary for the cafeteria.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. It includes the equipment for the cafeteria.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said to the Senator that I was perfectly willing to use the desk that Methuselah used—the older the desk the better—and that I do not mind old tablecloths and I do not mind old chairs. All I am saying is that I should like to have a little space and a little equipment for the cafeteria.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will get space.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the item can be substantially cut. I am not arguing with the Senator from Illinois. I think the Senator from Illinois makes a valid point. However, I do not think the United States Senate makes greater its standing in grandeur or honor by seeing if it can deny itself the rudiments of essential living.

I do not expect that we should have anything glorious and good. Perhaps we could have paper spoons, but at least have them clean. I submit that plenty of the spoons we are using are not clean.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And Senators should have a place to sit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. I hope that this amendment, which will save \$500,000, will be adopted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have one more point to make. I am going to take the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have stated heretofore that I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Illinois. However, I have seen him here in the Chamber over and over again make more speeches and get less votes—

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. He does that more than anyone I know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Mexico is eminently correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is all right. I know Illinois, and I know New Mexico.

Let us talk about this bill. Who passed the bill to refurbish the old Senate Office Building? Congress did that.

The Senate did its part. Is there any responsibility under that law to carry it out?

We wanted to do this properly. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] propounded a question to Mr. Stewart.

I will frankly state what I did. I took a poll of my office staff in order to get a general idea what their opinions were, and they were predominantly in favor of new furniture if they would be of the group that would go into the new office.

No one has to take new furniture. As a result of that, every Senator received a questionnaire, to determine whether he wanted new furniture. If my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, wants to take his old furniture with him, we will even refurbish it for him. We will fix it up nicely, so that he can take it to the new building.

Accommodations are being provided in the new buildings for committee and staff rooms for 12 of the 15 standing committees of the Senate.

Why did the Senate pass the bill? Why did we spend \$22.6 million for the building if we wanted to have empty rooms, including committee rooms?

The 315 office rooms include forty 5-room suites for the use of the Senators and their senatorial staffs. That might be wrong, but it is still the law. We provided the money.

The Senator will realize, of course, that an authorization for a building, or for work on the Mississippi River is of no value, unless we provide the money with which to carry on the project. That is what we did.

In answer to the questionnaire sent to each Senator, 46 expressed a desire to have a five-room suite in the new building. Thirteen desired to remain in the old building, and 16 were undecided.

Mr. ELLENDER stated, "I am one of those 16."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that is the way the Senator from Louisiana feels. Any Senator who wants to stay in the old building can stay there. No one is trying to force him to move.

What are we going to do with the old building? We are talking about \$22.6 million. Are we going to use the building, or will we have it there with empty rooms? All we are asking to do is to have the Congress or the Senate tell us what to do. We think the money included in this bill is proper for this session.

I will say this to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois: I hope we do not spend more than \$250,000. If we do not need the money, it will not be spent. I assure the Senator of that fact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Mississippi, who is on the committee, answer some questions for me, please?

On page 875 of the record, at the bottom of the page, I find a statement by Mr. Stewart as follows:

Mr. STEWART. Now, percentagewise on the new furniture, 72 percent of the 75 Senators were in favor of it, and on the moving into the new building there were 61 percent of the Senators replying to the questionnaire, or 46, that wanted to move over there.

Did the fact that 72 percent of the 75 Senators indicated they wanted new furniture move the committee to recommend the \$1 million appropriation?

Mr. STENNIS. As a whole, we considered, first, general services to Senators, the public, and everyone else. For example, the building includes an auditorium, which will serve somewhat the same purpose as the present caucus room. It will serve everyone.

The cafeteria has already been mentioned. There are large rooms, including the Appropriations Committee rooms, and rooms for 13 other standing or subcommittees. All those rooms must be furnished, and that is where some of the higher figures come in. The building will not accommodate more than from 40 to 44 Senators, so all Senators are not going to move into it. A great number of committee staffs will go into the committee rooms. Many of the larger sums would be taken up by those items. But I have no exact picture in mind of any particular number. I was thinking in terms of giving some discretion to the Senate Office Building Planning Commission, with reference to buying furniture.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For how many Senators would the \$1 million provide completely new furniture?

Mr. STENNIS. The estimate for completely new furniture for whatever number of Senators would be permitted to move, plus all the committee rooms and the other facilities I have mentioned, was \$1,350,000. A reduction was made to \$1 million, as I have explained.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may address a question to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall yield the floor in a moment.

Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the words uttered by the Senator from Illinois. We cannot expect to obtain economical administration from the various departments of Government and from our employees, unless the chief shows a determination to be prudent. In my opinion nothing worse could be done by the Senate than to set a bad example in the matter of husbanding the moneys entrusted to our care by the taxpayers of the United States.

This is only a small item, but my experience has definitely pointed out to me that if we want our clerks, our secretaries, and our janitors to be prudent, we ourselves should be prudent. It makes no difference what Senators say on this floor. The fact is that the people of the United States, who are bearing the cost of Government, will not subscribe to the idea that merely because we have a new building, each one of us must have new furniture. If we are to speak of economy, and then, by deed and example, proclaim for all to see that the words are mere utterances, and never intended to be translated into reality, we render a disservice.

I think these items are significant items.

In this connection, there was a discussion of the buying of furniture for the Army Air Force, especially custom-made furniture. How can we tell them to come down to earth if we are flying up in the skies?

I subscribe fully to the position taken by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to address 2 or 3 questions to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who had a great deal to do with reporting the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. KERR. The intimation has been made on the floor that we seek to appropriate money to buy new furniture for all 96 Members of the Senate. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the program provided for in the bill is to purchase new furnishings only for the new offices in the new building?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, the Senator is correct. All the new furniture covered by the bill pertains to the new building.

Mr. KERR. And all Senators who remain in the old building—and that will be at least half the total number of the membership of this body—will continue to use the furnishings in the old building, will they not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Nothing is contemplated in the way of new furniture for Senators remaining in the old building. Incidentally, my election so far is to remain in the old building.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that, so far as furniture for Senators in the new building is concerned, we provide only one chair for each Senator who is to move there?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. The other furnishings which will be there will be for the office help, the public, and constituents.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it the idea of the committee to provide facilities which will expedite the handling of the business of Senators—facilities for constituents who come here, and for the staffs which take care of the services requested by the constituents?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the sole purpose of the plan. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the \$1 million is not for Senators' furniture alone, but, as the Senator has said, to provide facilities in the building?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Will there not be a school there for the pages of the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The new building will include a pages' school, which will require school-room equipment, chairs, desks, and items of that kind.

Mr. KERR. There will also be an auditorium, where committee meetings and hearings on questions of wide public interest can be held, and where substantial room can be made available for constituents who have an interest, and wish to attend the hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi believes that a major part of the money actually spent will be for furnishing committee rooms, subcommittee rooms, and conference rooms, together with the offices which go with them. That was one of the main original purposes of the building, to serve the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that actually a good deal less than 5 percent of the amount will be spent for furniture to be sat in or handled by Senators themselves?

Mr. STENNIS. A very small percentage of it will actually come in contact with Senators, or be in the rooms of Senators. This is an estimate which provides money which the Commission can spend, but is not required to spend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I was engaged in this colloquy, I wish to state my position clearly.

The junior Senator from Minnesota is not asking for even as much as a new pencil sharpener, much less than any new furniture. But I say again that I do not think it is becoming of this body to equip itself in such a manner that it cannot do its work.

I am perfectly willing to go on record as saying that there are literally hundreds of lost hours of work because of the inadequacy of facilities of the United States Senate to accommodate employees and constituents.

My office has a space less than 9 feet long and 4 feet wide to take care of constituents who come to visit me. While they are not coming in great numbers—we average about 35 a day from my State—many others come in. It is impossible to find places for them to sit or to be received. There are three chairs in the waiting room. One of them belongs to me. The other two belong to the Government. I would be glad to buy two chairs, and require the Government to buy only one.

All I am asking for is adequate facilities. The Senator from Illinois has said that the space problem is not involved.

I understood that the \$1 million was not to buy a new desk for a Senator, as such; not to buy new typewriters; not to buy new carpeting, except insofar as new carpeting is necessary for the new offices. I understood that most of the proposed sum was to go for general facilities to equip the building, and not for the individual comfort of an individual Senator, even though that would not be such a bad idea, because when a Senator becomes ill, often he must go to the hospital, and sometimes he goes to a Government hospital. So it would not be wrong to make it possible for a Senator to be comfortable, although I do not think that is a perquisite of public service.

However, I resent the fact that my employees are made uncomfortable. I wish to make a point of it, so long as I have the floor. I have had to put 7 or 8 employees in a room equipped for 3 or 4. A number of them have become ill. They have had to go to the doctor, because the room is not adequately ventilated. I have complained for months and years, and have tried to get air into the rooms.

The air-conditioning system does not work.

If this is not sensible, I should like to know what does make sense.

Finally, the cafeteria and restaurant facilities of the Capitol are an abomination. Every country in the world to which we give foreign aid has better restaurant facilities for its people than does the Government of the United States. If a person wishes to get something good to eat, he must go to the Methodist Building or somewhere else. He need not look for it around the Capitol.

I am not complaining about the people who operate the restaurant. They have nothing with which to work. They have a restaurant equipped to serve 45, but they must try to put 400 into it. It requires quite a man to do that. So in this appropriation, if there is any way to accommodate constituents and taxpayers, that is fine. I think it would be all right even to put up a sign, "Senators not allowed."

I submit that when someone comes down to Washington to see us, we ought not to have to fight our way into the Senate restaurant, like a Rocky Marciano. If there is any way by which we can do the job frugally and prudently, I suggest we do it. We had an opportunity to build the Senate Office Building 2 or 3 years ago. If we had done that, we would have saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. The longer we delay the more it will cost. Costs are going up, whether we like it or not.

I remember when we voted on the new Senate Office Building. We held back building it for 4 or 5 years. In the meantime costs have gone up 35 or 40 percent, and we are taking that out of the backs of our taxpayers. The time to do something is when it needs to be done.

I am perfectly willing to have the amendment adopted, and hold back buying any new desks or other office equipment for Senators. However, I am sick and tired of the United States Senate denying itself clean forks and knives. I am sick and tired of listening to people say that the Senate restaurant is a sacred cow. It is about time that we provide proper facilities for our employees. Senators can be foolish if they want to. That is their privilege. Perhaps that is why they get into politics. However, our employees take literally hours and hours and waste their time, at taxpayers' expense, waiting to get a sandwich. The cost of the sandwich gets to be \$10 by the time an employee is able to get it. That is all because we do not have proper facilities to take care of our own people. We are trying to operate the Capitol as if we were back in the days of William Howard Taft. We may still have some attitudes like that around here, but we cannot operate the mechanics of the Capitol in that way.

The operations of the Capitol need to be modernized in every possible way. If anything can be done to modernize them, I am in favor of it. We need more modern equipment and modern offices. In the long run, if we do that, we will get better government. We will do a better job. It has all been long overdue.

That has been my view for a long time, although I have never expressed it quite so vigorously before. However, I have come to the conclusion that apparently we do not know how to bring the session to an end, and perhaps we spend more time on these little things than we do with other affairs of the Government. What we ought to do is speak plainly. Perhaps we get a little more insight on the problems connected with little things than with big things. We get a better insight into the little things with which we have to deal. I cannot understand the delay we have had in all these things year after year. Why? It is because the Senate and the House are reluctant to take care of their own affairs. They will appropriate for the Army and Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission. CIA is building a great new office building in Langley, Va. It is to cost millions of dollars. That is for the cloak-and-dagger boys of the CIA. That is fine. Then we are going to put up a new atomic energy building in Maryland. However, the minute we start to talk about facilities for Congress, we become reluctant to do anything about it, or even to provide the facilities which are required, commensurate with the responsibilities of the job. If we do not do it for ourselves, we should at least do it for our secretaries and for all our other employees. I, for one, resent the fact that there are not adequate facilities provided in the Capitol for the public employees and for the constituents who come to visit us.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the tourists and visitors who come to the offices of Senators in the Capitol are increasing year by year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. It has reached the point where it is hard for a Senator to get on the trolley to come from the office building to the Capitol to do his Senate work.

Mr. KERR. Is it not wholesome for the people to come to see the Government and the men who run it, and in that way give us the benefit of their views?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is the most wonderful thing in the world. I am always glad to encourage our young people to come to the city to see the Capitol and to have an opportunity to visit the great monuments and museums and historical sights of the city.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator from Minnesota tried to get a lunchroom so that he could have a group of high-school seniors from his State, for example, at lunch in the Capitol?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that although hope springs eternal in the human breast, what the Senator has mentioned is beyond hope.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I think it goes right straight down the line. There is not the slightest question that there will be more people coming to Washington next year than this year, and a great deal more the succeeding year than there will be next year. Restaurants and other facilities ought to be provided so as to give them at least the ordinary courtesies Senators

would like to afford their constituents. Unless we get on with the job, we will still be next year where we are now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had hoped that we would wind up the discussion earlier than this. However the Senator from Minnesota, as he usually does, has opened up a number of questions which I believe need some comment. The question is not space or restaurants. The question is furniture for the new office building, where five-room suites will be provided, as they will be in the old office building. There will be provided, as I understand, a reception room, where we can greet our constituents. There will also be provided more space for the clerical staff. That situation is going to be met. There will also be a cafeteria. I hope my friend from Minnesota and his associates and constituents will enjoy meals there, and that they will suffer neither from malnutrition nor from food poisoning. The question is whether the new suites are to be equipped with completely new furniture. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] points out that in the testimony of the Architect, at the bottom of page 875 of the hearing, it is shown that the new suites in the new office building are to be equipped with new furniture.

The Senator from Ohio asked a question of the Senator from Mississippi, to which the Senator from Mississippi did not quite respond. The Senator from Ohio wanted to know if the total cost of \$1 million could be broken down so that we could get the specific amounts to be devoted to the purchase of new furniture in the new office building, and new furniture in the old office building as may be provided. I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi has those figures, because that is the question at issue.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have any figures specifically along the line the Senator mentions. The general idea was that most of the old furniture would be required to be used in the old building, because it will continue to be used there, unless Senators now in the old building move into the new building and want to take their old furniture with them, in which case they could do so. I am sorry that I do not have the exact figures. The Senator is referring to the private office of a Senator?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not merely the private office. It is a suite of offices. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Stewart stated that as a result of a questionnaire, 54 Senators expressed the view that the building should be furnished with new furniture. That meant the building, not the private office of a Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe there is some confusion on this question. Here is what happened. The Architect of the Capitol sent a questionnaire to every Senator, in which this question was asked: "Do you believe that the offices in the new building should be equipped with new furniture?"

That is a question which 75 percent of the Senators answered in the affirmative. There is no provision in the bill for new furniture in any part of the old building; none whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much is provided for new furniture in the new building? That is what I want to find out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. For new furniture in the new building, including committee rooms and the cafeteria and rooms for secretaries and administrative assistants, and for the committee staffs, and all that, the estimate was \$1,350,000. The committee cut that amount to \$1 million.

I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois—and this is confirmed by the testimony before the committee during the course of the hearings—that while there has been no formal resolution adopted by the Senate Office Building Commission to the effect that the furniture would be procured through competitive bidding, at a meeting of that Commission I believe every member stated that he was in favor of competitive bidding. I believe it appears in the testimony in the hearings that the furniture would be procured by competitive bidding.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he knows of any way of furnishing a five-room suite with furniture from a three-room suite.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Illinois will yield to me to answer that question, I will say that it is not contemplated that the furniture be moved from the old building to the new building. After all, the offices in the old building will remain.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was assuming that the furniture would be moved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To answer the Senator's question directly of course it could not be done.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not possible to furnish five rooms with the furniture from three rooms. That is my point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If a Senator picked up all the furniture in the present three-room suite and moved it over to his five-room suite, it would be necessary to buy furniture to replace what he had moved.

Incidentally, we made a survey as to what furniture was on hand that could be used as a replacement or to supplement furniture in the old building. It just was not there. I believe it was the consensus of the Commission that the new building ought to be furnished with new furniture.

It was felt that there should be some leeway—in other words, that if a Senator was particularly anxious to retain a desk which he had been using or some other item of furniture he had been using, he could do so—although I believe the poll indicated that at least 75 percent of the Members of the Senate felt that only new furniture should be used in the new building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has now cleared up one point; he has stated directly, several times, that old furniture is not to be transported from the old building

to the new one, and that the new building is to be completely equipped with new furniture. This is exactly the point the Senator from Ohio and I have not only been trying to find out about, but which we have questioned. It seems to be extraordinarily difficult to make this point clear to our colleagues. Perhaps I may state it as follows: Let us consider a room 16 by 20 feet, thus having a total of 320 square feet. Let us assume that there are six desks in the room. In that event, each desk will have approximately 50 square feet of space available to it. Obviously, such an arrangement results in overcrowding. When the new office building is put into use, it will not be necessary to move all those six desks to the new building. Instead, perhaps 3 of them can remain in the old building, and 3 can be moved into the new building.

The Senator from Ohio and I are saying that some of the old furniture should be transported to the new building and should be used there. In that way, there will be more space per desk and per clerk. That is our point.

I should like to suggest to my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, whom I admire very much, that the Architect certainly was somewhat at fault in not stating a breakdown of his item of \$1,350,000. Certainly the Architect should have shown how much was for the auditorium, how much was for the cafeteria, and how much was for equipping the new offices. I take it that no such estimates were given.

Mr. STENNIS. I have none of the estimates here. Those are matters for the Commission which is handling all such items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did it have such estimates?

Mr. STENNIS. The Architect was representing the Commission, when he submitted the estimate, as I understand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He did not have a breakdown, did he?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, there was some breakdown.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was the estimate for the nonfurniture items?

Mr. STENNIS. I have tried to inform the Senator from Illinois as best I could, to the best of my knowledge. Roughly speaking, I think at least half, or more than half, of the money was for the auditorium and for the committee rooms, aside from the expense for the five-room suites for Senators. I would estimate that 60 percent was for the auditorium and the committee rooms.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator

from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may present a conference report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1747) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1957, pp. 15070-15074, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there were very minor differences between the two versions of the bill, as passed by the two Houses. The points of difference were readily reconciled. The bill was passed unanimously by each House.

Rather than make a detailed explanation of the adjustments made in the conference committee, as between the two versions of the bill, as passed by the two Houses, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with brief explanations of the key amendments which were agreed to in the conference.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1747

The conference substitute differs from the Senate bill in that under the substitute—

(1) The State poultry inspection agency (in any State having such an agency) would not be the sole agency entitled to initiate proceedings for the designation of a major consuming area.

(2) Exemption from labeling requirements would not be required to be consistent with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(3) Knowledge would be an element of the offense of possessing false inspection certificates, memorandums, and devices.

(4) The Secretary would be permitted to make exemptions from the prohibitions relating to New York dressed poultry. (The purpose of this is to afford the necessary time for conversion of plants to eviscerating operations.)

(5) Injunction proceedings would not be authorized.

(6) Somewhat tighter penalties are provided for first and second offenses.

(7) The authority to refrain from reporting violations for criminal prosecution would not be limited to "minor" violations.

(8) Exemption of certain groups would be mandatory rather than permissive and producers selling to restaurants, hotels, and boarding houses would be exempt.

(9) The jurisdiction of the Secretary provided by the bill would expressly be made exclusive.

(10) Overtime inspection costs would be charged to processors on an average instead of absolute basis.

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1747

There were a great many differences between the bill as passed by the Senate and the House amendment to S. 1747. The great majority of these differences were of a technical nature involving no difference in intent between the House and the Senate. The conferees agreed on a substitute for the House amendment, which differs from the Senate bill in the following material respects:

First, the Senate bill provided that hearings for the designation of a major consuming area for regulation could be initiated only upon application by the State poultry inspection agency if there was such an agency. In the absence of such an agency, the application might be made by any appropriate State or local official, or any appropriate poultry industry group. The House amendment provided for the application being made by the appropriate governing official or body of a substantial portion of the area to be designated, or upon application by an appropriate local poultry industry group. The conference substitute provides for application by any appropriate State or local official or agency of a substantial portion of the area, or application by an appropriate local poultry industry group. In any State having a State poultry inspection agency, that agency would be the appropriate State agency to make application, but this would not preclude application being made by an appropriate local official or poultry industry group.

Second, the Senate bill authorized the Secretary to grant exemptions from labeling requirements not in conflict with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The House amendment did not permit any exemption. The conference substitute provides for the exemption, but provides that the exemption shall not be in conflict with the purposes of the act; since determination that an exemption is not inconsistent with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act might require interagency consultation, delay issuance of the exemption, and cause difficulties in administration.

Third, the House amendment made knowledge an element of the offense of possessing false inspection certificates, identifications, or devices without notifying the Secretary of Agriculture. Since a purchaser or other person might innocently come into possession of a product bearing a false certificate and have no means of knowing that it was false; the Senate provision might have imposed a penalty upon the very person whom it was designated to protect. The conference substitute therefore makes knowledge an element of the crime of possessing such false identifications or devices. Knowledge would not, of course, be an element in cases of uttering, publishing, or using a false identification or device.

Fourth, the Senate bill prohibited transportation of New York dressed poultry except between official establishments and to foreign countries. In view of the fact that considerable time has elapsed since the bill was first considered by the Senate and that there might not be sufficient time for plants to convert to production of an eviscerated product prior to the effective date of the act, this exception was changed to permit the Secretary to make such limited exemption from this prohibition as might be necessary.

Fifth, the Senate bill provided for the use of injunctions in enforcing the act. The House amendment did not contain this provision, and it appeared that the other methods of enforcement provided for by the act were sufficient. The conference substitute

does not contain provision for injunction proceedings.

Sixth, the Senate bill provided for imprisonment for up to 1 year and a fine of up to \$5,000 for a first offense and imprisonment for up to 2 years and a fine of up to \$10,000 for all subsequent offenses. Under the House amendment, the latter penalty would not be imposed until the third offense and the former would not be imposed until the second offense. The House amendment placed the maximum penalty for the first offense at imprisonment for up to 6 months and a fine of up to \$3,000. The conference substitute adopted the somewhat lighter penalties provided by the House amendment.

Seventh, under the Senate bill, the Secretary was not required to report minor violations for criminal prosecution if he believed that the public interest would be adequately served and compliance obtained by a written warning notice. The House amendment made this provision applicable to all violations and the House conferees contended that the use of the word "minor" would always result in the Secretary's action being subject to question. It also appeared to the conferees that in many cases the administrative penalties, such as the withdrawal of service, would be sufficient so that criminal prosecution would not be required. The further fact that knowledge is not an element of many of the offenses under the act, including those committed by producers and other exempted persons, made adoption of the broader House provision appear advisable. The conference substitute, therefore, would not require the Secretary to report any case for criminal prosecution where the public interest would be adequately served and compliance obtained with a written warning notice.

Eighth, the Senate bill authorized the Secretary to make exemptions in certain cases, while the House amendment required such exemptions to be made. It was always the intention of the Department to make these exemptions and of the sponsors of the Senate bills and the Senate that these exemptions should be made. The conference substitute, therefore, adopts the mandatory language of the House amendment. The House amendment enlarged the exemption provided by this section for poultry producers to extend it to those selling to restaurants, hotels, and boarding houses for use in their own dining rooms, or in the preparation of meals for sales direct to consumers. The conference substitute adopts this enlargement of the exemption.

Some question has arisen in connection with the religious exemption which was contained in both bills. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that poultry processed in accordance with religious dietary laws is exempt from the act, so that such dietary laws may be observed. This will permit kosher poultry to be slaughtered by a shochet, dressed with cold water, and sold to the housewife uneviscerated, as required by the laws of Kashruth.

Ninth, the House amendment provided that the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture within the scope of the act would be exclusive. While it is difficult to see how regulation by the Secretary under the act could do otherwise than occupy the field and thereby preclude State regulation of the same subject, this amendment would make it clear that Federal regulation under the bill would preclude State regulation of the same subject.

Tenth, the Senate bill required the processor to bear the cost of overtime performed in his plant. The conference substitute makes it clear that the Secretary may require reimbursement upon the basis of average costs rather than upon the basis of the salary of the particular individual performing the overtime work at a particular plant.

Other material points in dispute were determined in accordance with the Senate position as follows: (1) Reinspection may be conducted whether processing operations are then being conducted or not; (2) labeling may not be false or misleading "in any particular"; (3) knowledge is not an element of offenses by exempted persons; and (4) the House provision providing a rule of construction against invalidation of State law was rejected.

Since the bill was passed by the Senate, a question has been raised as to whether squabs are covered by it. Poultry is defined in the bill as live or slaughtered domesticated birds. Commercially produced game birds, which would include squabs, are, therefore, not covered.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, immediately preceding the vote on the conference report, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the poultry inspection bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In adopting the conference report the committee recognized that while the sale of New York dressed poultry is diminishing there are nevertheless some responsible and efficient processors of this style of poultry who still sell in interstate commerce for the purpose of fulfilling a bona fide consumer demand.

The New York dresser would face problems under compulsory poultry inspection which are special and apart as compared to those which the eviscerator may face. Some of these problems are:

(1) The additional expense and investment which would be required to convert a New York dressing operation into an approved eviscerating plant under compulsory inspection.

(2) The additional time which would be over and beyond the expense mentioned in (1) above.

(3) The development of a new marketing program—hitherto the New York dresser has been selling customers, many of whom do not use eviscerated poultry, and hence would have to build a new customer list under compulsory inspection. This also would take time and money.

(4) An employee training program would be required to indoctrinate the employees in the methods and procedures used in producing ready-to-cook poultry as compared to New York dressed.

(5) Also some poultry producers could suffer hardship in finding outlets for live chickens in the event they had been selling their chickens to a New York dressing plant which suddenly found itself out of business.

Taking this into consideration the conference committee adopted language which extended to the Secretary of Agriculture authority to grant such extensions pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by him as he deemed necessary and practical.

The provisions of section 9, subsection (1), as approved by the committee of conference will authorize the Secretary to permit under regulations, the continued marketing of dressed poultry—commonly referred to as New York dressed—to consumers for such periods of time as he deems practicable to avoid hardship because of the problems involved in shifting from New York dressed to an eviscerated type of product. It was not the intent of the committee, by this provision, to prohibit at any time the movement of New York dressed product between official establishment for further processing, or for export, as was clearly contemplated by the House and Senate bills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been discussing with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOL- LAND], a matter in connection with the poultry-inspection bill. It is covered by the statement on the part of the managers on the part of the House, which appears in the report. I ask that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that all points of discussion may be covered by the proceedings which will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1170) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1747) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H. R. 6814 as passed by the House on July 9, 1957. The bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment which has been agreed upon by the conferees. Except for changes of a clarifying or technical nature, following are the differences between the House amendment and the committee substitute.

SECTION 5

This section follows substantially the House language but has been modified to include a provision of the Senate bill which provides that application for a hearing by the Secretary may be made by an appropriate State official, as well as by those persons designated in the House amendment. As recommended by the conferees, the section now provides that three classes of persons may make application to the Secretary for designation of an area as a "major consuming area." These are: (1) Any appropriate State official representing a substantial portion of such area; (2) any appropriate local official or agency of a substantial portion of such area; or (3) an appropriate local poultry industry group in such area.

The committee of conference reemphasizes the fact that this provision as reported by the conferees provides that the public hearing contemplated is a quasi-legislative hearing and the facts or opinions submitted thereat may be supplemented by investigations by the Secretary to aid in his determination as to whether a designation of an area should be made. Such hearing and investigation are to develop not only information as to the volume of poultry marketed in a major consuming area, but all other facts which would bear upon the question as to whether the designation of such an area will tend to effectuate the purposes of the act.

SECTION 6

Section 6 is substantially the House language. Subsection (b) was amended to make it clear that reinspection, quarantine, and segregation of poultry may take place at any time and need not be done when the plant is in operation.

In connection with post mortem inspection, the committee of conference in adopting the House language reiterates the interpretation

of the language as contained in the House report that "the Secretary * * * shall at all times provide sufficient inspectors and employ such procedures as will not slow down processing operations in the plants being inspected."

SECTION 7

The committee of conference has followed the House language in section 7 and, in doing so, points out that there is no authority in this bill for the Secretary to withdraw inspection from all of the plants operated by a company if he finds that only one or more of such plants are not complying with regulations. Inspection is on a plant-by-plant basis and may be withdrawn only from the particular establishment "whose premises, facilities, or equipment, or the operation thereof, fail to meet the requirements of this section."

SECTION 8

Subsection (a) was identical in both the House and Senate versions except that the Senate bill contained authority for the Secretary to permit reasonable variations and grant exemptions from the labeling requirements in any manner not in conflict with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The conference substitute permits exemptions but requires only that they shall not be in conflict with the purposes of this act.

Subsection (b) was identical in both bills except that the Senate bill used the words "in any particular" in connection with labeling which is "false or misleading." The conferees have adopted the Senate language in this case as being more nearly in conformity with other similar statutes.

SECTION 9

Section 9 is identical with the language of the House amendment except that a modification has been made in subsection (1) to permit the Secretary to grant some extension of time to processors of "New York dressed" poultry to comply with the provisions of the act. The effective date of the act with respect to its compulsory features is January 1, 1959. In view of the time which has elapsed since introduction and committee consideration of the bills the conference committee felt that some extension of this time might be needed by some processors of "New York dressed" poultry to permit the change-over of their plant and operations to the processing of eviscerated poultry. The amendment to the House language will permit the Secretary to grant such extension "pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed" by him. It is, however, the intent of the bill that the prohibition against "New York dressed" poultry be made fully effective as soon as practicable.

SECTION 13

The committee of conference has adopted the House language in section 13 and, in doing so, points out that it is the intention of the committee that subsection (b) of this section should apply to public warehousemen who handle poultry products in the course of their movement from processor to consumer on the same terms as it will apply to a carrier. A public warehouseman is in precisely the same position as a carrier except that, instead of transporting, he stores goods for the general public for hire. It is the opinion of the committee of conference, therefore, that public warehousemen should be treated by the Secretary in exactly the same manner as carriers in enforcing the provisions of this act.

SECTION 17

The House language required knowledge as an element of guilt under this section with respect to a person who sells unwholesome or adulterated poultry under one of the exemptions of the act. The Senate bill did not require knowledge in this respect and the conference bill follows the Senate language.

SECTION 20

The conference bill follows substantially the wording of the House amendment with the addition of language to make it clear that the rates of overtime and holiday pay to be charged processing establishments may be established at a reasonable uniform rate instead of being figured on an individual basis. The holidays to be counted with respect to Federal employees are those which apply to Federal civil-service employees either by law or by Executive or administrative order. Holidays to be counted with respect to State employees will be those legally observed by employees of that State.

SECTION 24

The Senate bill contained no provision similar to section 24 of the House amendment. In view of adoption by the conference committee of the House language in section 19, providing that "the jurisdiction of the Secretary within the scope of this act shall be exclusive," the committee felt that section 24 would neither add to nor detract from the legal effect of the rest of the bill but might be confusing. It therefore did not include this section in the conference bill.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
JOHN C. WATTS,
CLARK W. THOMPSON,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 319. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State;

S. 364. An act for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.;

S. 534. An act to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconditioning, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in the continental United States;

S. 538. An act to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 556. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clark County, Nev., to the State of Nevada for the use of the Nevada State Board of Fish and Game Commissioners;

S. 620. An act to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads;

S. 919. An act to provide that certain employees in the Postal Field Service assigned to road duty, and rural carriers, shall receive the benefit of holidays created by Executive order, memorandum, or other administrative action by the President;

S. 1113. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass.;

S. 1417. An act relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma;

S. 1631. An act to amend certain sections of title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

S. 1823. An act to authorize the conveyance of Bunker Hill Island in Lake Cumberland near Burnside, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for public park purposes; and

S. 1971. An act to amend sections 4 (a) and 7 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 939) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that he offer his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I send to the desk an amendment which is submitted on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Marketing research and service," for marketing services, \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 1747 of the 85th Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senate has just adopted the conference report on the mandatory poultry inspection bill. The purpose of this amendment is to implement that legislation by providing the necessary funds with which to pay the inspectors.

I understand that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is favorable to the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Delaware what evidence there is to indicate that this is the correct amount? Why cannot it be less? We have had no evidence about it in the Appropriations Committee.

As the senior member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I should like to know about that. I am glad the chairman of the committee has agreed to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Department of Agriculture gave us that figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I called the Department of Agriculture; and it is my under-

standing that the Department budget office indicated, in response to a request from the committee staff, that consideration has been given to that figure. I told the chairman of the committee that we were perfectly willing to have the figure taken to conference, with that understanding. The bill the Senate passed a moment ago makes it mandatory for the Government to provide these inspectors.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had telephoned information that the Department of Agriculture had given preliminary consideration to this amount of money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

FARM HOUSING RESEARCH

To carry out the provisions of section 603 of the Housing Act of 1957 for farm housing research to be conducted by land-grant colleges through grants for research study and analysis, \$300,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this amendment relates to a provision of the Housing Act which was signed into law about 1 month ago. I think it is highly important that this work be begun.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand it is a 2-year proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it is a 2-year proposal, for \$300,000 for the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

Mr. HAYDEN. Inasmuch as a part of the present fiscal year has passed, will the Senator from Alabama be willing to reduce the item by one-half? Then we can take the amendment to conference and can see what will happen there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee and also with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I would be willing to cut the item in half, with the understanding that the provision of some money in this case will enable those responsible for the work to begin their plans; and in January or February, in the next session, when another supplemental bill is before the Senate, perhaps by then those who are in charge of the work will be able to give the Senate an understanding of what will be necessary in order to carry the work forward. It may be that \$150,000 will be sufficient for the first year.

Mr. HAYDEN. And of course, a new program takes some time to get under way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has discussed the matter with me. It is another case in which there has been no estimate in connection with the new law, which was signed on June 30, and, as the Senator from Alabama has said, authorizes \$300,000 for the 2 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have the chairman of the committee accept the amendment and take it to conference, to see what figure may be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator from Alabama modify the amendment in the way indicated?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Mr. President, I modify the amendment by striking out "\$300,000", and inserting "\$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, so I can submit the conference report on House bill 8240, which authorizes certain construction at military installations? The report contains items affecting the appropriation bill the Senate has been considering today, and the report has already been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I think it would be appropriate to have the report considered at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 20.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have before me certain statements which are explanatory of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles totaled \$1,416,573,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version totaled \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for title I, II, and III is \$1,232,495,000. This later sum is \$184,078,000 less than the House version and \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version.

I wish to direct the Members' attention to section 406 as it was agreed to by the conferees, which in substance is identical to that contained in the Senate version except that it eliminates the applicability of the section to Wherry Housing and is designed to make certain that Wherry Housing would be acquired at any installation where title VIII Capehart Housing is planned for construction.

It is the intent of this legislation that the current housing programs of the various services continue as now contemplated through June 30, 1958. This section does not repeal any existing law. It simply requires that effective July 1, 1958, the number of military family housing units to be contracted for at or in support of any military installation must be first authorized by an annual military construction authorization act before it can be contracted for.

CHANGES TO H. R. 8240 (SENATE) IN CONFERENCE

Army—title I

Added Fort Sam Houston, Tex., land acquisition, \$675,000 (was in House version).

Replaced Fort Jackson hospital authorization in deficiency authorization section; conferees increased original amount of \$5 million to \$7,500,000 (South Carolina).

Navy—title II

Inside United States: (increased by \$14,181,000).

Added to NAS, Pensacola, Fla., \$3,512,000 for pier; final authorization, \$6,225,000.

Deleted entire item for NAAS, Edenton, N. C., \$199,000.

El Toro, Calif., Marine Corps Air Station, added \$209,000; final authorization, \$3,620,000.

Replaced John H. Towers Field (for Naval Academy) with some language change, and to be located at Andrews AFB, \$3,200,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., added \$1,500,000 for headquarters building, final authorization, \$2,372,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., added \$1,501,000 for barracks; final authorization, \$2,643,000.

Marine Corps School, Quantico, Va., added \$49,000 for utilities; final authorization, \$1,923,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif., added \$207,000 for ground improvements, final authorization, \$2,331,000.

Replaced Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., final authorization, \$2,649,000.

Replaced Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md., final authorization, \$1,52,000.

Outside United States (increased by \$504,000):

Replaced Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa, final authorization, \$504,000.

Air Force—title III (increased by \$13,722,000)

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., added \$393,000; final authorization, \$674,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, added \$141,000; final authorization, \$358,000.

Replaced Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa., \$2,438,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Ga., added primary runway and apron taxiway, \$10,750,000; final authorization, \$13,104,000.

New totals

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Inside United States.....	\$115,624,000	\$230,356,000	\$394,076,000
Outside United States.....	34,477,000	48,199,000	160,705,000
Classified.....	143,002,000	59,056,000	47,000,000
Total.....	293,103,000	337,611,000	601,781,000
Grand total.....	1,232,495,000		

DEFENSE OFFICIALS' COMMENTS ON APPROPRIATED FUNDS VERSUS CAPEHART

Reference to statements by military officials concerning appropriated fund housing versus payment (Capehart family housing construction programs). You will re-

member Secretary Wilson said when asked his opinion as a businessman:

"I think the answer to that is 'Yes,' that it is cheapest to do it with Government funds, unless you do it in such a way that it is more or less off your military post or something like that in a separate housing business.

"But if we have to be responsible for the rent for 20 years or something like that, or repurchase it like we have to do with warehouses, I would say it really would be cheaper to put the money up in the first place, because, basically, our Government has the best credit in the United States; it can borrow money cheaper.

"This was an effort, I suppose, to avoid taxing the people now with a big budget and trying to get the budget down."

Secretary Wilson further said in responding to a question concerning the possibility of overbuilding of family housing units:

"As I said awhile ago, I believe in evolution, not revolution, and I am very frank to say that if we could suddenly build within 1 year all the stated requirements of the services for housing, we would overbuild and we would have a particular reaction from the public, because these people are living someplace now; they are not quite living where they would like to, but millions of other Americans are not quite living where they would like to either.

"I think it [referring to family housing] needs to be improved and it is one of the morale factors in keeping the good men in the service. And I want to make some progress with it but I do not want to try to do it overnight and make some big mistakes."

Secretary Quarles when asked a similar question responded in part:

"I certainly agree that appropriated funds would show a lower cumulative cost over amortization."

Assistant Secretary of the Army Dewey Short when he appeared before the committee said in response to your question:

"Senator STENNIS. Would you mind a brief interruption right there? We have been concerned with you, about which is the best program. Are you free to give us an opinion—I will put it this way: Don't you think the Government gets more for its dollar just to go on and appropriate the money and build these houses?

"Mr. SHORT. There is no doubt about it. I have felt for years and think most of the members of the House Armed Services Committee have felt strongly for a long time that you get more for your dollar by having appropriated funds for houses. The only trouble is that the need is so great and the volume of money needed is so enormous we can't do it."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there was provided by the Congress for the fiscal year 1958 a total of \$211,183,000 for the medical-research programs, represent-

ing an increase of \$21 million over the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submission in the President's budget.

The National Institutes of Health submitted apportionment requests for the first quarter of the fiscal year, in accordance with provisions of the antideficiency statute, for a total of \$138,522,850. The Bureau of the Budget approved apportionment allowances of \$120,805,000 for the first quarter, a reduction of \$17,717,850.

The Senate should have no sympathy with the arbitrary and capricious administrative action of the Bureau of the Budget withholding a substantial portion of the funds appropriated by Congress for medical research. The appropriations subcommittees and the full Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress reviewed in great detail the research programs proposed by the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 1958. Scientists and doctors from both the National Institutes of Health and from private institutions presented factual testimony showing that there are urgent problems to be attacked by medical research, and that a successful attack requires additional funds. A committee of conference carefully reviewed the actions taken by both Houses, and reached decisions reflecting weeks of hearings and study.

Officials in the Bureau of the Budget then perverted a law—the antideficiency statute—to override the considered will of Congress by making available to the National Institutes of Health for the first quarter of fiscal year 1958, \$17.7 million less than was available and needed.

If the refusal of the Bureau of the Budget to make available to the National Institutes of Health the full amount appropriated by Congress is not reversed, the medical research of the entire National Institutes will be seriously set back. Carefully planned research will be cut off—for example, studies in infectious diseases, including research aimed at dealing more effectively with the influenza epidemic which now threatens the Nation. The continuing research for oral drugs for diabetes will be impaired. The research for drugs effective in dealing with cancer, which has developed so auspiciously over the past year, will be definitely handicapped, and many other urgent and vital programs will suffer. The full effects appear in detailed material submitted for inclusion in the hearings on the pending bill.

In addition to these specific harassing and very injurious impediments, the action of the Bureau of the Budget seriously interferes with the orderly and efficient execution of the Government's business by establishing fiscal uncertainty as a principle of administration. Finally, the action directly and irresponsibly thwarts the will of Congress.

In short, the Bureau of the Budget, under the guise of technical provisions of a law designed to prevent overspending by executive agencies, has imposed upon the American people their judgments as to the proper levels of research support contrary to the will and judgment of the

Congress. This is a most serious and disturbing development in our system of Government, and one which Congress cannot allow to pass unrecognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to ask a few questions of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Air Force Academy. I refer to the 47 housing facilities which are to be built at that Academy. They are to house the Superintendent and the deans. The Superintendent's house was to cost \$75,000. There were to be 2 houses at \$50,000 each, and 44 houses at \$30,000 each.

The first question concerns what is supposed to be custom-made furniture which has been requested. Has the committee approved of the type of furniture which has been requested?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that, in the first place, it was considered not proper to have a \$95,000 house for the head of the Academy. It was not considered proper to have a \$75,000 house for the dean, as the Senator will see from the committee report. The committee has not approved those figures. It was not considered proper to have the other items to which the Senator has referred. The board of estimates and those who have to do with the Air Academy at Colorado Springs have nothing to do with those figures.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I should like to learn particularly is actually what the deans are paid. Do I understand correctly that each one has a house provided?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Each dean is supposed to have a house provided for him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many houses will be provided for how many teachers? The figure is 47, as I have read it from the record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not be surprised if the Senator were correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I refer to page 375 of the hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I also see, by referring to page 376, that 25 percent of the houses are to be furnished, at a cost of \$5,000 for each house.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator refers to page 376 of the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; in the middle of the page.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

I read from page 376 of the hearings:

Senator SMITH. You say you are not going to have custom-made furniture for the houses. Could you give us an estimate of how much it is going to cost for the furnishings in the houses?

Colonel Witters.—

I had a letter from Colonel Witters today. He is leaving. He is through with that place.

Colonel WITTERS. Senator, we are planning on 44 colonels' houses and 25 percent of them will be furnished with Government furniture at \$5,000 a house.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, am I correct in my understanding that one-quarter of those houses will be furnished at a cost of about \$5,000 each?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, \$5,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the teachers' annual salary?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will have salaries, they will have houses, and they will get furniture benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator from New Mexico tell me what their yearly salary is?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I cannot tell the Senator that. It depends on what category a teacher is in. As I understand from a member of the staff, it is roughly \$10,000 a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, their salaries would be approximately \$10,000 a year, and they would be furnished with houses to live in?

Mr. CHAVEZ. A salary, a house, \$5,000 worth of furniture, and the Senator would be surprised what else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the total sum for architect's fees for the Air Force Academy will be about \$8½ million, covering the entire project?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is low in his figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps the figure is \$9½ million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will be more than that. The total amount now appropriated, if the Senator from Mississippi will bear me out, is about \$116 million; but we shall be lucky, when we get through, if it is not \$150 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I find, from looking at page 383 of the hearings, that we shall pay the architects 6 percent for plans and 3 percent for supervision.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Some Georgia boys got in there. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from New Mexico give me his views on the chapel, which is supposed to be built at a cost of \$3 million?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe in prayer—

Mr. LAUSCHE. So do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But not to that extent. Yes, I believe in prayer, but I think that the chapel sought to be provided for the Air Force Academy is un-Christian.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Un-Christian?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Ohio the Senator from New Mexico and I feel the same way, and I know the distinguished Representative from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, emphasized that, while we in the Congress cannot design the chapel, we can be critical. We were very critical a year ago. There was a great deal of criticism at that time. I have personally discussed the question with the Secretary of the Air Force and urged that he give just as much attention to that matter as he possibly can, to see if there cannot be built a chapel—and we want a chapel there—that is reasonable in cost, and is satisfactory and pleasing in design, without being extreme in design.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would say, over and above that, let us have a chapel that has humility, that is fit to be the House of

the Lord. Let us not have an extravaganza.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us have a chapel that will reflect Christianity.

An attempt is being made to construct a chapel at Colorado Springs which does not represent Christianity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico, on the basis of the questions which he put in the committee hearings. Every one of them indicates a purpose of practicing economy and using decent and good judgment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I truly believe that the Air Academy at Colorado Springs, the Academy at West Point, and the Naval Academy should all have religious services. But I do not believe that in order to carry out religious purposes it is desirable to have a type of chapel which indicates material wealth. I do not believe that is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9131) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the project program for military construction approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for execution by the Services for the fiscal year 1958, and concurred in by the Senate, in the passage of the appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958

Department of the Army	
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
Ordnance Corps:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.....	\$2,288,000
Anniston Ordnance Depot, Ala.....	2,015,000
Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California.....	130,000
Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.....	758,000
Seneca Ordnance Depot, Oreg.....	136,000
Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebr.....	249,000
Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oreg.....	258,000
White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.....	16,530,000
Total, Ordnance Corps.....	22,364,000
Quartermaster Corps:	
Atlanta General Depot, Ga.....	1,579,000
New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.....	1,095,000
Fort Lee, Va.....	5,417,000
Seattle Quartermaster Depot, Wash.....	40,000
Sharpe General Depot, Calif.....	765,000
Fort Worth General Depot, Tex.....	1,789,000
Total, Quartermaster Corps.....	10,685,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Army

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Chemical Corps:	
Fort Detrick, Md.	\$627,000
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	54,000
Total, Chemical Corps	681,000
Signal Corps: Fort Huachuca, Ariz.	2,703,000
Army Security Agency: Vint Hill Farms, Va.	328,000
Corps of Engineers:	
Cold Regions Laboratory, New Hampshire	2,496,000
Fort Belvoir, Va.	2,120,000
Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill.	765,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	5,381,000
Transportation Corps:	
Brooklyn Army Terminal, N. Y.	1,169,000
Charleston Transportation Corps Depot, S. C.	306,000
Fort Eustis, Va.	1,197,000
Total, Transportation Corps	2,672,000
Medical Corps:	
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colo.	937,000
Walter Reed Medical Center, District of Columbia	1,920,000
Total, Medical Corps	2,857,000
Total, technical services	47,671,000
First Army:	
Fort Devens, Mass.	4,712,000
Fort Dix, N. J.	54,000
Fort Niagara, N. Y.	209,000
Fort Totten, N. Y.	242,000
Total, First Army	5,217,000
Second Army:	
A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Va.	153,000
Fort Knox, Ky.	4,404,000
Fort George Meade, Md.	5,955,000
Fort Ritchie, Md.	820,000
Total, Second Army	11,332,000
Third Army:	
Fort Benning, Ga.	1,583,000
Fort Bragg, N. C.	1,051,000
Fort Campbell, Ky.	5,117,000
Fort McClellan, Ala.	326,000
Fort Rucker, Ala.	5,778,000
Fort Stewart, Ga.	3,691,000
Total, Third Army	17,546,000
Fourth Army:	
Fort Bliss, Tex.	7,704,000
Fort Hood, Tex.	4,130,000
Fort Polk, La.	7,734,000
Total, Fourth Army	19,568,000
Fifth Army:	
Fort Carson, Colo.	1,049,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	459,000
Fort Riley, Kans.	3,353,000
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.	4,663,000
Total, Fifth Army	9,524,000
Sixth Army:	
Fort Lewis, Wash.	2,748,000
Fort Ord, Calif.	3,449,000
Total, Sixth Army	6,197,000
Total, continental armies	69,384,000
United States Military Academy, N. Y.	3,466,000
Armed Forces special weapons project:	
Bossier Base, La.	164,000
Clarksville Base, Tex.	200,000
Killeen Base, Tex.	379,000
Lake Mead Base, Nev.	138,000
Manzano Base, N. Mex.	50,000
Medina Base, Tex.	125,000
Total, Armed Forces special weapons project	1,056,000
Tactical sites, continental United States	1,736,900

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Army

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Tactical support facilities:	
First Army:	
Belmore, N. Y.	\$1,201,000
Boston defense area, Massachusetts	58,000
Camp Kilmer, N. J.	2,381,000
Fort Totten, N. Y.	200,000
Second Army: Cleveland defense area, Ohio	350,000
Third Army: Oak Ridge defense area, Tennessee (Fort Campbell)	740,000
Fourth Army: Fort Sheridan, Ill.	359,000
Sixth Army:	
Camp Hanford, Wash.	1,045,000
Fort Lewis, Wash.	811,000
Fort MacArthur, Calif.	1,192,000
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	120,000
Total, tactical support facilities	8,466,000
Total, continental United States	131,779,000
OVERSEAS	
Alaska:	
Alaska general	658,000
Eielson Air Force Base	248,000
Fort Greely	1,891,000
Ladd Air Force Base	1,878,000
Fort Richardson	6,447,000
Tactical sites	4,910,000
Total, Alaska	16,032,000
Pacific: Tripler Army Hospital, Territory of Hawaii	154,000
Caribbean:	
Fort Buchanan, P. R.	137,000
Fort Gulick, C. Z.	289,000
Total, Caribbean	426,000
France	20,754,000
Korea	9,000,000
Okinawa	8,000,000
Total, overseas	54,366,000
CLASSIFIED	
Various locations—including tactical	150,405,000
GENERAL AUTHORIZATION	
Advance design	8,222,000
Capehart utilities	4,000,000
Emergency construction	1,000,000
Minor new construction	6,400,000
Total, general authorization	19,622,000
Grand total, Army	365,172,000

Department of the Navy

Class

Shipyard facilities, continental:	
Naval engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md.	618,000
Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.	25,438,000
Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1,452,000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.	1,500,000
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.	2,966,000
Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic and Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Va.	11,779,000
Subtotal, shipyard facilities, continental	43,753,000
Shipyard facilities, overseas:	
Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, T. H.	1,297,000
Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands	1,750,000
Naval station, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands	7,576,000
Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Pacific and Pacific Fleet, Makalapa, Oahu, T. H.	10,502,000
Locations classified: Oceanographic research facilities	2,751,500
Subtotal, shipyard facilities, overseas	23,876,500
Total, shipyard facilities	67,629,500

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Navy

Class

Fleet base facilities, continental:	
Naval station, Key West, Fla.	\$1,326,000
Naval station, Long Beach, Calif.	544,000
Naval station, Newport, R. I.	2,729,000
Subtotal, fleet base facilities, continental	4,599,000
Fleet base facilities, overseas:	
Naval station, Adak, Alaska	246,000
Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, T. H.	332,000
Naval station, San Juan, P. R.	190,000
Subtotal, fleet base facilities, overseas	768,000
Total, fleet base facilities	5,367,000
Aviation facilities, training:	
Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.	566,000
Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex.	140,000
Naval air station, Glynnco, Ga.	293,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.	160,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Meridian, Miss.	13,387,000
Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La.	4,152,000
Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.	2,713,000
Subtotal, aviation facilities, training	21,411,000
Aviation facilities, fleet support:	
Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.	537,000
Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine	340,000
Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.	5,249,000
Auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing, Calif.	39,000
Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.	4,849,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.	9,175,000
Naval seaplane facility, Hertford, N. C.	8,548,000
Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla.	152,000
Naval air station, Key West, Fla.	130,000
Naval air station, Lemoore, Calif.	27,535,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Mayport, Fla.	384,000
Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.	3,601,000
Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.	1,739,000
Naval air station, North Island, Calif.	9,384,000
Naval air station, Oceana, Va.	7,527,000
Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.	2,697,000
Naval auxiliary landing field, San Clemente Island, Calif.	9,448,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.	2,953,000
Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Wash.	9,365,000
Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Fla.	1,537,000
Classified locations	806,000
Subtotal, aviation facilities, fleet support	105,995,000
Aviation facilities, marine aviation:	
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.	5,638,000
Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.	6,503,000
Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.	7,511,000
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.	3,782,000
Marine Corps air facility, New River, Jacksonville, N. C.	39,000
Subtotal, aviation facilities, marine aviation	23,473,000
Aviation facilities, special:	
Naval air development center, Johnsville, Pa.	39,000
Naval air station, Patuxent River, Md.	2,209,000
Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.	3,808,000
Subtotal, aviation facilities, special	6,056,000
Aviation facilities, overseas:	
Naval air station, Agana, Marianas Islands	428,000
Naval station, Argentina, Canada	1,793,000
Naval air station, Barbers Point, T. H.	2,085,000
Naval air station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands	149,000
Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	6,423,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Navy	
Class	
Aviation facilities, overseas—Con.	
Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, T. H.	\$249,000
Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands.	69,000
Naval station, Midway Island, T. H.	69,000
Naval air station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.	15,517,000
Location classified.	2,643,000
Subtotal, aviation, overseas.	29,428,000
Total, aviation facilities.	186,363,000
Supply facilities, continental:	
Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.	92,000
Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pa.	155,000
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.	550,000
Subtotal, supply facilities, continental.	797,000
Supply facilities, overseas:	
Naval station, Adak, Alaska.	1,550,000
Naval station, Guam, Mariana Islands.	884,000
Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands.	397,000
Subtotal, supply facilities, overseas.	2,831,000
Total, supply facilities.	3,628,000
Marine Corps facilities, continental:	
Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.	814,000
Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.	7,616,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.	428,000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.	1,766,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.	1,469,000
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.	1,875,000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.	116,000
Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, Calif.	2,108,000
Total, Marine Corps facilities.	16,192,300
Ordnance facilities, continental:	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.	316,000
Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.	564,000
Location classified (AC-1).	5,004,000
Location classified (WC-1).	178,000
Location classified (WC-2).	410,000
Locations classified (Polaris facilities).	17,775,000
Subtotal, Ordnance facilities, continental.	24,247,000
Ordnance facilities, overseas:	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H.	326,000
Location classified (S-1).	59,000
Location classified (S-2).	2,468,000
Location classified (WP-1).	3,345,000
Subtotal, ordnance facilities, overseas.	6,198,000
Total, ordnance facilities.	30,445,000
Service school facilities, continental:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.	1,602,000
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, Calif.	2,052,000
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.	5,598,000
Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.	1,613,000
Total, service school facilities.	10,865,000
Communication facilities, continental:	
Naval communication station, Norfolk, Va.	443,000
Naval communication station, San Diego, Calif.	100,000
Naval Communication Center, Stockton (San Francisco), Calif.	889,000
Naval radio station, Washington County, Maine.	16,192,000
Subtotal, communication facilities, continental.	17,624,000
Communication facilities, overseas:	
Naval radio station, Adak, Alaska.	1,053,000
Naval communication station, Finegayan, Guam.	594,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Navy	
Class	
Communication facilities, overseas—Con.	
Naval security group activity, Istanbul, Turkey.	\$130,000
Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands.	1,467,000
Naval security group activity, Sakata, Japan.	69,000
Naval radio station, Wahiawa, T. H.	4,392,000
Subtotal, communication facilities, overseas.	7,705,000
Total, communication facilities.	25,329,000
Office of naval research facilities: Location classified.	
	3,100,000
Total, Office of naval research facilities.	3,100,000
Yards and docks facilities, continental:	
Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	332,000
Public works center, Norfolk, Va.	3,244,000
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.	1,984,000
Advance planning.	6,000,000
Replacement of damaged facilities.	4,000,000
Special minor facilities.	3,000,000
Capehart housing.	4,000,000
Commodity Credit housing.	3,000,000
Subtotal, yards and docks facilities, continental.	25,560,000
Yards and docks facilities, overseas:	
Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands.	393,000
Replacement of temporary family quarters.	2,040,000
Subtotal, yards and docks facilities, overseas.	2,433,000
Total, yards and docks facilities.	27,993,000
Grand total, military construction, Navy.	376,911,800
Department of the Air Force	
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
Air Defense Command:	
Duluth MAP, Duluth, Minn.	5,115,000
Ethan Allen AFB, Burlington, Vt.	594,000
Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.	2,721,000
Glasgow AFB, Glasgow, Mont.	3,737,000
Grand Forks AFB, Grand Forks, N. Dak.	9,481,000
Hamilton AFB, Ignacio, Calif.	1,641,000
K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Mich.	2,365,000
Kinross AFB, Kinross, Mich.	1,660,000
Klamath Falls MAP, Klamath Falls, Oreg.	1,743,000
McChord AFB, Tacoma, Wash.	632,000
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Maryville, Tenn.	491,000
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minneapolis, Minn.	23,000
Minot AFB, Minot, N. Dak.	10,927,000
Niagara Falls MAP, Niagara Falls, N. Y.	2,149,000
Otis AFB, Falmouth, Mass.	9,454,000
Oxnard AFB, Camarillo, Calif.	2,525,000
Pescadero Consolant, Calif.	584,000
Portland IAP, Portland, Oreg.	3,828,000
Presque Isle AFB, Presque Isle, Maine.	4,522,000
Richard Bong AFB, Kansasville, Wis.	23,821,000
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Belton, Mo.	1,213,000
Selfridge AFB, Mount Clemens, Mich.	8,275,000
Sioux City MAP, Sioux City, Iowa.	1,061,000
Stewart AFB, Newburgh, N. Y.	735,000
Suffolk County AFB, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.	956,000
Trux Field, Madison, Wis.	7,226,000
Tyndall AFB, Springfield, Fla.	3,186,000
Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda, Mich.	3,778,000
Youngstown MAP, Vienna, Ohio.	1,892,000
Various locations (ADC storage).	14,717,000
Various locations (BOMARC).	42,963,000
Various locations (land).	1,465,000
Total, Air Defense Command.	175,460,000
Air Force Academy: USAF Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.	
	8,921,000
Air Materiel Command:	
Brookley AFB, Mobile, Ala.	2,583,000
Griffiss AFB, Rome, N. Y.	13,351,000
Griffiss AFB and Stock, N. Y.	922,000
Hill AFB, Ogden, Utah.	3,040,000
Kelly AFB, San Antonio, Tex.	1,044,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Air Force	
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES	
Air Materiel Command—Continued	
McClellan AFB, Sacramento, Calif.	\$6,544,000
Norton AFB, San Bernardino, Calif.	851,000
Ohlsted AFB, Middletown, Pa.	5,753,000
Robins AFB, Macon, Ga.	7,568,000
Rushmore AFS, Rapid City, S. Dak.	56,000
Searsport AFB, Searsport, Maine.	745,000
Stony Brook AFB, Holyoke, Mass.	88,000
Tacoma FSS, Tacoma, Wash.	251,000
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City, Okla.	8,737,000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton, Ohio.	10,950,000
Total, Air Materiel Command.	62,483,000
Air proving ground:	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso, Fla.	7,677,000
Eglin Auxiliary No. 9, Fort Walton, Fla.	600,000
Total, air proving ground.	8,277,000
Air Research and Development Command:	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tenn.	7,000,000
Edwards AFB, Rosamond, Calif.	5,116,000
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo, N. Mex.	12,513,000
Indian Springs AFB, Indian Springs, Nev.	711,000
Kirtland AFB, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	2,386,000
Langley G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.	8,508,000
Patrick AFB, Cocoa Beach, Fla.	1,000,000
Patrick Auxiliary No. 1, Cape Canaveral, Fla.	271,000
Patrick Auxiliary No. 3, Grand Bahama, British West Indies.	1,011,000
Patrick Auxiliary No. 5, San Salvador, British West Indies.	423,000
Patrick Auxiliary No. 6, Mayaguana, British West Indies.	23,000
Patrick Auxiliary No. 7, Grand Turk, British West Indies.	304,000
Total, Air Research and Development Command.	39,066,000
Air Training Command:	
Amarillo AFB, Amarillo, Tex.	9,595,000
Chanute AFB, Rantoul, Ill.	299,000
Craig AFB, Selma, Ala.	2,211,000
Harlingen AFB, Harlingen, Tex.	743,000
J. Connally AFB, Waco, Tex.	2,693,000
Keesler AFB, Biloxi, Miss.	2,243,000
Lackland AFB, San Antonio, Tex.	3,440,000
Laredo AFB, Laredo, Tex.	76,000
Luke, Litchfield Park, Ariz.	3,752,000
Mather AFB, Sacramento, Calif.	5,582,000
McConnell AFB, Wichita, Kans.	763,000
Moody AFB, Valdosta, Ga.	3,465,000
Nellis AFB, Las Vegas, Nev.	509,000
Perrin AFB, Sherman, Tex.	2,667,000
Randolph AFB, San Antonio, Tex.	2,941,000
Reese AFB, Lubbock, Tex.	7,603,000
Scott AFB, Shiloh, Ill.	2,722,000
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls, Tex.	8,012,000
Stead AFB, Reno, Nev.	2,753,000
Vance AFB, Enid, Okla.	2,635,000
Vineyard AFB, Yuma, Ariz.	3,001,000
Webb AFB, Big Spring, Tex.	4,208,000
Williams AFB, Chandler, Ariz.	2,626,000
Total, Air Training Command.	78,537,000
Air University:	
Gunter AFB, Montgomery, Ala.	340,000
Maxwell AFB, Montgomery, Ala.	350,000
Total, Air University.	690,000
Continental Air Command:	
Brooks AFB, San Antonio, Tex.	552,000
Dobbins AFB, Marietta, Ga.	791,000
Mitchell AFB, Hempstead, N. Y.	337,000
Total, Continental Air Command.	2,080,000
Headquarters Command: Bolling AFB, Washington, D. C.	
	550,000
Military Air Transport Service:	
Alex. Chart Information Center, St. Louis, Mo.	1,162,000
Andrews AFB, Camp Springs, Md.	5,802,000
Charleston AFB, Charles, S. C.	3,320,000
Dover AFB, Dover, Del.	2,368,000
McGuire AFB, Wrightstown, N. J.	1,281,000
Total, Military Air Transport Service.	13,933,000
Strategic Air Command:	
Altus AFB, Altus, Okla.	1,054,000
Barksdale AFB, Bossier City, La.	3,884,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Air Force

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Strategic Air Command—Continued	
Beale AFB, Marysville, Calif.	\$9,568,000
Bentley AFB, Austin, Tex.	1,524,000
Biggs AFB, El Paso, Tex.	5,876,000
Blytheville AFB, Blytheville, Ark.	11,810,000
Bunker Hill AFB, Peru, Ind.	10,041,000
Carswell AFB, Fort Worth, Tex.	3,414,000
Castle AFB, Atwater, Calif.	3,027,000
Clinton-Sherman AFB, Burns Flat, Okla.	3,614,000
Columbus AFB, Columbus, Ohio	2,670,000
Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson, Ariz.	6,179,000
Dow AFB, Bangor, Maine	17,444,000
Dyess AFB, Abilene, Tex.	971,000
Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City, S. Dak.	2,217,000
Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash.	2,028,000
Forbes AFB, Topeka, Kans.	2,001,000
Gray AFB, Killeen, Tex.	34,000
Greenville AFB, Greenville, Miss.	20,802,000
Homestead AFB, Homestead, Fla.	2,370,000
Hunter AFB, Savannah, Ga.	2,456,000
Lake Charles AFB, Lake Charles, La.	721,000
Larson AFB, Moses Lake, Wash.	13,381,000
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio, Tex.	346,000
Lincoln AFB, Lincoln, Nebr.	501,000
Little Rock AFB, Jacksonville, Ark.	11,440,000
Lockbourne AFB, Columbus, Ohio	9,790,000
Loring AFB, Limestone, Maine	3,501,000
MacDill AFB, Tampa, Fla.	5,570,000
Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls, Mont.	4,924,000
March AFB, Riverside, Calif.	4,380,000
Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home, Idaho	10,700,000
Offutt AFB, Omaha, Nebr.	449,000
Pinecastle AFB, Orlando, Fla.	2,561,000
Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh, N. Y.	2,394,000
Portsmouth AFB, Portsmouth, N. H.	3,445,000
Schilling AFB, Salina, Kans.	3,138,000
Travis AFB, Fairfield, Calif.	9,357,000
Turner AFB, Albany, Ga.	13,942,000
Walker AFB, Roswell, N. Mex.	2,033,000
Westover AFB, Chicopee Falls, Mass.	471,000
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster, Mo.	
Total, Strategic Air Command	216,876,000

Tactical Air Command:	
Clovis AFB, Clovis, N. Mex.	3,248,000
Donaldson AFB, Greenville, S. C.	5,367,000
England AFB, Alexandria, La.	3,154,000
Foster AFB, Victoria, Tex.	1,416,000
George AFB, Adelanto, Calif.	4,285,000
Langley AFB, Hampton, Va.	292,000
Myrtle Beach, Myrtle Beach, S. C.	1,500,000
Sewart AFB, Smyrna, Tenn.	1,422,000
Seymour Johnson AFB, Goldsboro, N. C.	10,716,000
Shaw AFB, Sumter, S. C.	2,790,000
Total, Tactical Air Command	34,260,000

AFOAT, Zone of Interior	1,236,000
Aircraft control and warning system	81,461,000
Various locations	107,000,000

RESERVE FORCES CONSTRUCTION

Bakalar AFB, Columbus, Ind.	319,000
Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn.	423,000
Clinton County AFB, Wilmington, Ohio	2,855,000
Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla.	40,000
General Billy Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis.	16,000
Greater Cincinnati Airport, Covington, Ky.	3,963,000
Hill AFB, Ogden, Utah	3,091,000
McClellan AFB, Sacramento, Calif.	3,065,000
Paine AFB, Mankato, Minn.	425,000
Pinellas Airport, St. Petersburg, Fla.	2,657,000
Portland Airport, Portland, Oreg.	610,000
Scott AFB, Shiloh, Ill.	864,000
Tinker AFB, Midwest City, Okla.	2,172,000
Wilkes-Barre ARC, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	412,000
Total, Reserve Forces construction	20,912,000

Total, Continental United States... 851,751,000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaskan Air Command: Alaska	22,871,000
Air Materiel Command: France	247,000
Far East Air Force:	
Hawaii	2,711,000
Okinawa	4,908,000
Philippines	3,400,000
Total, Far East Air Force	11,019,000
Military Air Transport Command:	
Azores	9,708,000
Bermuda	7,203,000
Total, Military Air Transport Command	16,971,000

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958—Continued

Department of the Air Force

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Strategic Air Command:	
Canada	\$67,566,000
Greenland	15,782,000
Guam	9,280,000
Morocco	1,123,000
Puerto Rico	6,317,000
Spain	11,214,000
United Kingdom	2,011,000
Total, Strategic Air Command	113,273,000
United States Air Forces, Europe:	
AFE, France	2,941,000
AFE, Germany	1,965,000
AFE, Middle East	17,844,000
Greece	2,747,000
Libya	619,000
Saudi Arabia	575,000
Various	13,903,000
AFE, United Kingdom	4,987,000
Total United States Air Forces, Europe	27,737,000
AFOAT overseas	403,000
Aircraft control and warning, overseas:	
Greenland	20,000,000
Canada	568,000
Total, aircraft control and warning overseas	20,568,000
Various locations overseas	2,480,000
Total, outside continental United States	215,560,000
Planning	25,000,000

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Minor construction	18,000,000
--------------------	------------

SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Support activities	31,200,000
Total	1,141,520,000
Less application of Spanish pesetas	19,000,000
Less anticipated reimbursements	4,408,000
Total, new program, Air Force, fiscal year 1958	1,118,112,000

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

Mr. President, for the information of Senators who have asked questions about the matter, I believe the record should reflect that there was authorized for the Air Force Academy, in the original bill, the sum of \$126 million. This bill authorizes an additional \$8,921,000. The subcommittee held the authorization up for a time, thinking there had been a great abuse of discretion in the construction of the institution.

I believe the cost of construction before it is over, will be \$150 million. Computed at a 4-percent interest rate, the annual interest would be \$6 million. With the expected rate of graduations, if we should charge the interest to the graduating class, it would amount to more than \$10,000 per graduate cadet, for the graduation year, to pay the interest on the debt which that institution will cost the taxpayers. This demonstrates the enormous sum involved and how the cost runs away when the Congress tries to vest an agency with discretion in building an institution

which is supposed to serve for a long time.

I make that statement for the information of Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a point of information on the appropriation bill we have passed, the item of \$375,000 for the World Health Assembly was included, as I recall. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not remember the exact figure, but there is an item in the bill for that purpose. I recall the item.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is for the World Health Organization.

I understand the item for the emergency ACP program, \$25 million, was likewise included. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct, as I recall. I do not have those figures in my mind, but I believe that is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is for the drought and flood-relief areas?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Minnesota, Oklahoma, and other States were included?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

PERMANENT MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 997, H. R. 5807, to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5807) to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5807) to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to insert "exclusive of part time or intermittent employees or native labor casually hired on an hourly or per diem basis"; on page 4, line 17, after the word "if", to strike out "after an investigation a finding is made that"; in line 20, after the word "of", to strike out "an active" and insert "a"; on page 5, line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "imprisonment," and insert "imprisonment," and, after line 11, to insert:

"(c) No part of any amount paid on any claim filed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section in excess of 10 percent of the first \$1,000 so paid on such claim, and 7 percent of the amount so paid over \$1,000, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any

person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when the Senate convenes tomorrow I ask that there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the benefit of the Senate, Mr. President, I believe I should reiterate that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow the call of the calendar will be in order, and we shall start the call from the beginning of the calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN ORGANS OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8992) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that Agency, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1200)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8992) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the

organs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that Agency, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "Be it enacted, etc. That this Act may be cited as the 'International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act of 1957'."

"SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative and a deputy representative of the United States to the International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter referred to as the 'Agency'), who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States on the Board of Governors of the Agency, may represent the United States at the General Conference, and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ of that Agency, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the Agency as the President may from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint or designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Conference of the Agency a representative of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Conference.

"(c) The President may also appoint or designate from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs of the Agency. The President may designate any officer of the United States Government, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States on the Board of Governors or to the General Conference of the Agency in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representative appointed under section 2 (a) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter.

"(d) All persons appointed or designated in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 866, 867), for Chiefs of Mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsection (b) or subsection (c) of this section as a delegate or representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Conference shall be entitled to receive such compensation. Any person who receives compensation pursuant to the provisions of this subsection may be granted allowances and benefits not to exceed those received by Chiefs of Mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance.

"SEC. 3. The participation of the United States in the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of the Agency set forth in its Statute and the policy concerning the development, use, and control of atomic energy set forth in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The President

shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress on the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and on the participation of the United States therein. In addition to any other requirements of law, the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission shall keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as appropriate, currently informed with respect to the activities of the Agency and the participation of the United States therein.

"SEC. 4. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the organs of the Agency, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the International Atomic Energy Agency as apportioned by the Agency in accordance with paragraph (D) of article XIV of the Statute of the Agency, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended; salaries as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, or as authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); translating and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section II of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); official functions and courtesies; such sums as may be necessary to defray the expenses of United States participation in the Preparatory Commission for the Agency, established pursuant to annex I of the Statute of the Agency; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

"SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order or regulation, a Federal employee who, with the approval of the Federal agency or the head of the department by which he is employed, leaves his position to enter the employ of the Agency shall not be considered for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, as separated from his Federal position during such employment with the Agency but not to extend beyond the first three consecutive years of his entering the employ of the Agency: *Provided*, (1) That he shall pay to the Civil Service Commission within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency all necessary deductions and agency contributions for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the period of his employment by the Agency, and (2) That all deductions and agency contributions necessary for continued coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be made during the term of his employment with the International Atomic Energy Agency. If such employee,

within three years from the date of his employment with the Agency, and within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency, applies to be restored to his Federal position, he shall within thirty days of such application be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status and pay.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order or regulation, any Presidential appointee or elected officer who leaves his position to enter, or who within ninety days after the termination of his position enters, the employ of the Agency, shall be entitled to the coverage and benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, but not beyond the earlier of either the termination of his employment with the Agency or the expiration of three years from the date he entered employment with the Agency: *Provided*, (1) That he shall pay to the Civil Service Commission within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency all necessary deductions and agency contributions for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the period of his employment by the Agency, and (2) That all deductions and agency contributions necessary for continued coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be made during the term of his employment with the Agency.

"(c) The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and to protect the retirement, insurance and such other civil service rights and privileges as the President may find appropriate.

"Sec. 7. Section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding the following new sentences: 'Unless hereafter otherwise authorized by law the Commission shall be compensated for special nuclear material so distributed at not less than the Commission's published charges applicable to the domestic distribution of such material, except that the Commission to assist and encourage research on peaceful uses or for medical therapy may so distribute without charge during any calendar year only a quantity of such material which at the time of transfer does not exceed in value \$10,000 in the case of one nation or \$50,000 in the case of any group of nations. The Commission may distribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency, or to any group of nations, only such amounts of special nuclear materials and for such periods of time as are authorized by Congress: *Provided*, however, That, notwithstanding this provision, the Commission is hereby authorized subject to the provisions of section 123, to distribute to the Agency five thousand kilograms of contained uranium-235, together with the amounts of special nuclear material which will match in amount the sum of all quantities of special nuclear materials made available by all other members of the Agency to July 1, 1960.'

"Sec. 8. In the event of an amendment to the Statute of the Agency being adopted in accordance with article XVIII-C of the Statute to which the Senate by formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent, upon notification by the Senate to the President of such refusal to advise and consent, all further authority under sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this Act, as amended, shall terminate: *Provided*, however, That the Secretary of State, under such regulations as the President shall promulgate, shall have the necessary authority to complete the prompt and orderly settlement of obligations and commitments to the Agency already incurred and pay salaries, allowances, travel expenses, and other expenses required for a prompt and orderly termination of United States participation in the Agency: *And provided further*,

That the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the Agency, and such other officers or employees representing the United States in the Agency, under such regulations as the President shall promulgate, shall retain their authority under this Act after such time as may be necessary to complete the settlement of matters arising out of the United States participation in the Agency" and the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALBERT GORE,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
HENRY DWORSHAK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL T. DURHAM,
MELVIN PRICE,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
STERLING COLE,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the matter in controversy between the two Houses was the amendment inserted on motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], relating to how the materials were to be supplied to the agency. The conference report strikes out the discrimination against the International Atomic Energy Agency and makes the same rule applicable to all groups of nations. It also provides that the allotments may be made for any specified periods of time. Upon that basis the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House were able to reach complete agreement. The report is signed by all conferees. It is brought up by agreement with the able minority leader. I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 6080) to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States in Gulfport, Miss., to the Gulfport Municipal Separate School District, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

TERMINATION OF VETERANS' EDUCATION APPEALS BOARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1020, H. R. 8076.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8076) to provide for the termination of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board, established to review certain determinations and actions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in connection with

education and training for World War II veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 20, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 19, 1957:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 88A (major general, Regular Air Force), in the rank of general, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Francis Hopkins Griswold, 94A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Dole Eckert, 560A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank A. Thornton, of California, to be collector of customs in customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif. (Reappointment.)

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Robert B. Anderson, of New York, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the term of 5 years.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Grant C. Barham, Bridgeport, Ala., in place of V. P. Mickam, retired.

ARKANSAS

Vernoy V. Godwin, Warren, Ark., in place of M. O. McClendon, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Glenn L. Thomas, Baker, Calif., in place of W. M. Anderson, resigned.

John P. Anderson, Lakewood, Calif. Office established December 31, 1956.

COLORADO

Robert W. Martin, Fort Morgan, Colo., in place of W. E. Bales, removed.

FLORIDA

William C. Davis, Leesburg, Fla., in place of A. W. Newett, Sr., deceased.

Walker A. Stanley, Ponce de Leon, Fla., in place of E. D. Padgett, transferred.

Victor Wray Irby, Zolfo Springs, Fla., in place of E. O. Sawyers, retired.

ILLINOIS

Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

INDIANA

Charles W. Hudson, Solisbury, Ind., in place of E. J. Myers, retired.

IOWA

Bryce L. Bremser, Dow City, Iowa, in place of W. F. Hulburd, retired.
Ernest K. Woods, Woodburn, Iowa, in place of C. G. Marquis, retired.

LOUISIANA

Eck H. Bozeman, Winnfield, La., in place of S. E. Jenkins, retired.

MARYLAND

Richard R. Sinnisen, Keedysville, Md., in place of T. D. Knode, retired.

MICHIGAN

Lyle G. Kaechele, Caledonia, Mich., in place of S. G. Beckman, resigned.

MINNESOTA

R. Dean Fischer, Brook Park, Minn., in place of S. M. Rasmussen, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Burl J. Faulkner, Vicksburg, Miss., in place of C. E. Crook, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Alice M. Dwyer, Hopatcong, N. J., in place of E. B. Helmrich, retired.
George C. Koepfel, Pennington, N. J., in place of T. H. Reed, retired.
M. Elizabeth Mathis, Rancocas, N. J., in place of M. E. Stevens, retired.
George W. Stader, South Amboy, N. J., in place of T. E. Downs, Jr., resigned.
Gerard G. Bisson, Whippany, N. J., in place of E. M. Fables, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Solomon G. Alvarez, Las Cruces, N. Mex., in place of L. B. Sexton, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Martin M. Cassidy, Ardmore, Okla., in place of E. A. Brown, removed.
Charles B. Smith, Barnsdall, Okla., in place of O. E. Cox, deceased.
W. Galen Dunn, Shawnee, Okla., in place of C. W. Craig, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Fay M. Lash, Bobtown, Pa., in place of F. J. Bierer, retired.
John Blackwood, Jr., Center Valley, Pa., in place of O. W. Gehris, retired.
Claude R. Coons, Covington, Pa., in place of F. W. Haverley, retired.
Bernard N. Murphy, Dushore, Pa., in place of B. B. Deegan, retired.
Helen Z. Swanson, Irvine, Pa., in place of C. J. Zuerl, Jr., resigned.
Robert F. Acker, Lake City, Pa., in place of L. A. Gossman, resigned.
Elmer E. Mower, Marcus Hook, Pa., in place of W. H. Heacock, retired.
C. Blaine Strickler, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of B. F. Sherick, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marvin F. Carpenter, Graniteville, S. C., in place of F. L. Zimmerman, retired.

TEXAS

W. Marion Higdon, Canyon, Tex., in place of G. J. Harp, retired.
Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.

WISCONSIN

Arthur G. Mehrling, Port Washington, Wis., in place of J. H. Biever, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 19, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Neil Hosler McElroy, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James H. Smith, Jr., of Colorado, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

John J. Gilhooly, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John Lewis Smith, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge, of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, for the term of 10 years.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Cecilia C. Conrath Joseph A. Staton
Mary L. Skinner John E. Baker, Jr.
Daniel Sullivan Demond O'Hara
Robert E. Tumelty

To be assistant sanitarians

Don M. Hufhines.
Richard E. Gallagher.
Charles P. Froom.

To be assistant scientist

Alfred L. Brophy, Jr.

PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant surgeons

Stephen R. Dunphy.
Emery A. Johnson.

To be assistant pharmacist

Paul O. Fehnel, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Morris D. Rosenblatt of the Congregation Knesseth Israel, Annapolis, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we stand before Thee confessing Thy sovereignty and reaffirming our belief that Thou art the Father of all men, the ruler of all lands. In Thy wisdom Thou hast granted us the faculty of appreciating the value of representative government.

We seek Thy guidance and inspiration for those who are charged with the great responsibility of directing the affairs of our Nation. May Thy spirit dwell richly within them as they manifest abiding courage and sincere faith, in the cherished tradition of our Founding Fathers, to work for the safeguarding of freedom, justice, and peace. Grant them loving kindness and patience, understanding and foresight, so that they will ever be warmed by Thy love and nurtured by Thy teachings.

Bless also, O Heavenly Father, all the people of our country. In our relations with one another may we ever remember that we are all Thy children, equally dependent upon Thee. Above divisive differences of race, creed, and social station, may we ever feel our common humanity and our common duties of justice and truth. Bring us together into an indissoluble bond of friendship and brotherhood that unitedly we may promote the welfare of our country and increase the happiness of our fellow men. Hear Thou our prayer and bless us with strength and peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 16, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 13, 1957:

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Beulah I. Reich;

H. R. 2259, an act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain real property in Prairie County, Ark.;

H. R. 3071. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into and to execute amendatory contract with the Northport Irrigation District, Nebr.;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Fernandez;

H. R. 3572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Russell;

H. R. 4511. An act to declare a certain portion of Back Cove at Portland, Maine, to be nonnavigable water of the United States;

H. R. 6570. An act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7213. An act for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas; and

H. R. 7522. An act to authorize the extension of certain rights to remove timber from lands acquired by the United States.

On August 14, 1957:

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Anna L. De Angelis;

H. R. 1520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai;

H. R. 1536. An act for the relief of Allison B. Clemens;

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Jacob Baronian;

H. R. 1552. An act for the relief of William H. Barney;

H. R. 1701. An act for the relief of Abram van Heyningen Hartendorp;

H. R. 1942. An act for the relief of the Sergeant Bluff Consolidated School District.

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Robert M. Deckard;

H. R. 2678. An act for the relief of Leona C. Nash;

H. R. 3077. An act that the lake created by the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River located at the confluence of the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers be known as Lake Seminole;

H. R. 3996. An act to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Lake Texoma for the purpose of water supply for the city of Sherman, Tex.;

H. R. 4730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie B. Prescott;

H. R. 4851. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Shelton Pruitt;

H. R. 4932. An act to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to increase the maximum rate of compensation which the director of the Metropolitan Police Force Band may be paid;

H. R. 5081. An act for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane;

H. R. 5220. An act for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai;

H. R. 5341. An act for the relief of John J. Farrelly;

H. R. 5365. An act for the relief of Robert B. Peterman;

H. R. 5718. An act for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis;